

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

# WORLD HERITAGE

**Convention** CONCERNING  
THE PROTECTION OF THE  
**World Cultural AND Natural  
Heritage**



WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

**KYOTO, JAPAN**

30 NOVEMBER - 5 DECEMBER 1998



**Distribution limited**

**WHC-98/CONF.203/18  
Paris, 29 January 1999  
Original : English/French**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION  
CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-second session  
Kyoto, Japan**

**30 November – 5 December 1998**

**REPORT**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Opening Session	<b>Page 1</b>	ANNEX I	List of Participants	<b>59</b>
II.	Adoption of the Agenda and Timetable	<b>2</b>	ANNEX II	Speeches	
III.	Election of the Chairperson, Rapporteur and Vice-Chairpersons	<b>2</b>	II.1	Speech by the Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO	<b>76</b>
IV.	Report of the Secretariat on activities undertaken since the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee	<b>2</b>	II.2	Message of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, delivered by the Japanese Ambassador to Osaka	<b>78</b>
V.	Report of the Rapporteur on the sessions of the World Heritage Bureau	<b>3</b>	II.3	Speech by the Parliamentary Vice-Minister of Education	<b>79</b>
VI.	Methodology and Procedures for Periodic Reporting	<b>4</b>	II.4	Speech by the Governor of the Prefecture of Kyoto	<b>80</b>
VII.	State of Conservation of Properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List	<b>6</b>	II.5	Message of the Mayor of the City of Kyoto	<b>81</b>
VIII.	Information on Tentative Lists and Examination of Nominations of Cultural and Natural Properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List	<b>24</b>	II.6	Speech by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee	<b>82</b>
			II.7	Speech by the Representative of The World Bank	<b>83</b>
			II.8	Speech by the Resident Representative to Japan of the Asian Development Bank	<b>85</b>
IX.	Follow-up to the Work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee	<b>32</b>	ANNEX III	Format and Explanatory Notes for the submission of Periodic Reports	<b>87</b>
X.	Progress Report, Synthesis and Action Plan on the Global Strategy for a Representative and Credible World Heritage List	<b>36</b>	ANNEX IV	Decision of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Kyoto, 28-29 November 1998) with regard to the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List	<b>93</b>
XI.	Examination of the World Heritage Fund and Approval of the Budget for 1999, and Presentation of a Provisional Budget for 2000	<b>39</b>			
XII.	Requests for International Assistance	<b>43</b>	ANNEX V	Statement of Thailand relating to the Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries	<b>113</b>
XIII.	World Heritage Documentation, Information and Educational Activities	<b>54</b>	ANNEX VI	Kakadu National Park, Australia	
XIV.	Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention	<b>56</b>	VI.1	Presentation by Prof. F. Francioni (Italy) concerning the World Heritage Mission to Kakadu National Park (Australia), 26 October-1 November 1998)	<b>114</b>
XV.	Date, Place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee	<b>57</b>	VI.2	Joint IUCN-ICOMOS Position Statement	<b>118</b>
XVI.	Date and Place of the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee	<b>57</b>	VI.3	First Statement by the Delegate of Australia	<b>119</b>
XVII.	Other Business	<b>57</b>	VI.4	Second Statement by the Delegate of Australia	<b>119</b>
XVIII.	Closure of the session	<b>58</b>			

ANNEX VII.1	Statement of Poland relating to the inscription of Classical Weimar (Germany)	<b>120</b>	ANNEX XI	Statements by Hungary	
VII.2	Statement by Poland relating to the inscription of L'viv (Ukraine)	<b>120</b>	XI.1	Invitation to hold a session of the World Heritage Committee	<b>126</b>
ANNEX VIII	Statement by Greece on authenticity	<b>121</b>	XI.2	Remarks on GIS-related Information to Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15	<b>126</b>
ANNEX IX	Statement by the former Chairperson relating to a Technical Assistance request for Turkey and Annex A of Document WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev.	<b>122</b>	XI.3	Proposal for Establishing a World Heritage Fellowship Programme	<b>127</b>
ANNEX X	Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee	<b>124</b>	ANNEX XII	Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem	<b>128</b>

## **I. OPENING SESSION**

**I.1** The twenty-second ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee was held in Kyoto, Japan, from 30 November to 5 December 1998. It was attended by the following members of the World Heritage Committee: Australia, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Republic of Korea, Thailand, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

**I.2** The following States Parties to the Convention who are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Holy See, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Nepal, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan and Vietnam.

**I.3** Representatives of the advisory bodies to the Convention, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of the Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and The World Conservation Union (IUCN) attended. The meeting was also attended by The World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC), The World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Asia/Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO, Environment Diplomacy Institute, Friends of the Earth, Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation, National Federation of UNESCO Associations in Japan (NFUAJ), Natural Resources Defense Council, The Nature Conservation Society of Japan (NACS-J), Pro Esteros (Mexico), The Wilderness Society Inc. and the World Monuments Fund. The complete list of participants is given in Annex I.

**I.4** The outgoing Chairperson of the Committee, Mr Francesco Francioni (Italy), opened the twenty-second session by thanking the Government of Japan, as well as the Prefecture and the City of Kyoto for generously hosting the Committee. In summarizing the activities of the Committee during the past year under his Chairmanship, Mr. Francioni remarked on the growing challenge of World Heritage protection. To enhance the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, he indicated the importance he attached to improving the working relations between the statutory bodies of the Convention and the UNESCO Secretariat. In this connection, he thanked the members of the Consultative Body appointed by the Committee and the members of the Bureau who worked diligently in addressing the four issues identified by the Committee for review, and for their work in the formulation of recommendations.

**I.5** In recalling the highlights of his work in his capacity as the Chairperson, special mention was made of the mission he was entrusted by the Bureau to undertake to Kakadu National Park in Australia. Citing this case as an example of the complexity of World Heritage protection, he stated that the authority of the Convention and its effectiveness depend on the Committee's capacity to address the difficult issues inherent in such cases. He concluded by thanking the Committee for the confidence entrusted to him and for their support.

**I.6** Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage of the Culture Sector of UNESCO, in his capacity as Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO, expressed the gratitude of UNESCO to the Government of Japan and to the local authorities and citizens of Kyoto for hosting this

Committee session. In delivering the speech on behalf of the Director-General (provided in Annex II.1), Mr Bouchenaki referred to the important intellectual and financial contribution made by Japan in advancing reflection on world heritage as well as in the tangible work of heritage conservation in many countries. He thanked, in particular, the generosity of the Government of Japan for the Funds-in-Trust contribution to UNESCO for cultural heritage preservation projects. He stated that the strong support being given by the public and private sectors in Japan for world heritage education and public information is another indication of the long-term commitment and vision of Japan for the World Heritage Convention. To meet the challenges of the multifarious threats to World Heritage, Mr Bouchenaki indicated the importance the Director-General has attached to strengthening the World Heritage Centre since its establishment in 1992 as a transdisciplinary, inter-sectoral co-ordinating entity within UNESCO. In this regard, he transmitted the Director-General's deep appreciation for the hard work and leadership provided by Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, during his 25 years of service at UNESCO for the cause of natural and cultural heritage conservation. Special mention was made of Mr von Droste's important contribution in developing the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme, then in building UNESCO's capacity for the protection, conservation and presentation of World Heritage through widening and strengthening partnerships in the collective international effort. In concluding his statement, Mr Bouchenaki expressed on behalf of his colleagues, his hope for Mr von Droste's continued involvement in world heritage protection even after his retirement from UNESCO.

**I.7** The Chairperson then invited the representatives of the host Government to deliver their welcoming remarks.

**I.8** The message of His Excellency Mr Masahiko KOUMURA, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, was delivered by Mr Hiromi SATO, Ambassador in Osaka. In his message (attached as Annex II.2), the Minister of Foreign Affairs stressed the strong support the Government and people of Japan have provided to the activities of UNESCO. International cultural exchange, notably through support for cultural heritage preservation via UNESCO and other multilateral channels, as well as through bilateral co-operation programmes has become an important aspect of Japan's foreign policy. International co-operation as foreseen within the framework of the World Heritage Convention, is therefore considered to be of particular importance to Japan.

**I.9** Mr Kensaku MORITA, Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Education, stressed in his speech (Annex II.3) the vital role of cultural heritage as a foundation of national identity. The understanding and respect for the heritage of all nations is therefore of great importance in fostering international peace. It is for this reason, he stated, that Japan supports the World Heritage Convention and educational activities to raise the awareness of both adults and children for the conservation of world heritage sites. Moreover, through the organization of expert meetings such as the Nara Conference on Authenticity, held in 1994, Japan has also tried to contribute to deepening the international understanding of cultural diversity and the concepts of authenticity that are linked to this diversity.

**I.10** Mr Teiichi ARAMAKI, Governor of Kyoto Prefecture, welcomed the Committee. Stating that cultural and natural heritage are increasingly threatened by industrial development, he said that the work of the World Heritage Committee is vital to enable future generations to benefit from the spiritual inspiration that heritage has provided to past generations (speech attached as Annex II.4). In noting the need for considerable financial resources and technological knowledge to counter these threats, the Governor called for greater international co-operation

between governments and also between local authorities throughout the world, as well as with non-governmental organizations.

**I.11** Mr Yorikane MASUMOTO, Mayor of the City of Kyoto, welcomed the Committee to Kyoto on behalf of the city's 1,460,000 citizens. In his speech (attached as Annex II.5) he stressed the important role which all citizens have in protecting the heritage of the past and in passing it intact to future generations. Kyoto's commitment to its role as guardian of the 14 historic monuments included in the World Heritage List is shown by the fact that a special "Kyoto Committee for Support of the 22<sup>nd</sup> Session of the World Heritage Committee" has been formed to assist and support its work. Mayor Masumoto observed that in an era of increasing globalization, the preservation of the spiritual values enshrined in the heritage is of increasing importance to develop inter-cultural understanding and tolerance. His goal is that Kyoto, which represents the soul of Japan, should be preserved as a meeting place for all the peoples and cultures of the world.

## **II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE**

**II.1** Upon the conclusion of the opening remarks, the Chairperson requested the Committee to adopt the Provisional Agenda and Timetable. At the request of the Delegate of Canada, the Committee agreed to include two additional matters under Item 9: the Green Note of the Director-General concerning the organization of the World Heritage Centre, and the workload of the Committee. It was agreed that the increasing number of nominations and state of conservation reports the Committee is expected to evaluate each year requires a review of its working method. The Agenda and Timetable as amended were adopted.

## **III. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, RAPPORTEUR AND VICE-CHAIRPERSONS**

**III.1** As proposed by the Delegate of Thailand, and endorsed by the Republic of Korea, Morocco, Zimbabwe, Benin, Canada, France, Australia, United States of America, Italy, Ecuador and Finland, Mr Koichiro MATSUURA (Japan) was elected as Chairperson by acclamation. The following members of the Committee were elected as Vice-Chairpersons by acclamation: Benin, Cuba, Italy, Morocco, and Republic of Korea, and Mr Janos Jelen (Hungary) as Rapporteur. It was mentioned that Cuba, Republic of Korea and Hungary would be members of the Bureau for the first time.

**III.2** The Committee warmly thanked the out-going Chairperson, Mr Francesco Francioni for the excellent leadership he provided the Committee during the past year which had resulted in closer working relations between the Committee and the Secretariat. The newly-elected Chairperson, Mr Koichiro Matsuura, expressed his appreciation for the remarkable manner in which Mr Francioni carried out his functions as Chairperson of the Committee.

**III.3** In assuming the Chair of the Committee, Mr Matsuura stated that the process of globalization occurring in almost all domains, has made the preservation of cultural diversity even more important. The fostering of understanding and respect for all cultures, each for its specificity, is essential and is part of the fundamental mission of UNESCO to promote mutual understanding and co-operation between all countries in the building of peace. In this regard, the World Heritage Convention, since its adoption a quarter of a century ago, has played a vital role. He identified three main issues that he felt required the continued attention of the Committee: the question

of geographical imbalance, the concepts of authenticity and integrity taking into consideration the different cultures, and lastly, the relationship with UNESCO. He concluded by indicating the importance of the venue of this session of the Committee, as the City of Kyoto, established more than 1200 years ago and designed to be in harmony with its natural surroundings has always placed culture as the goal of its development. Requesting the support of all present at this session to enable him to fulfill the important tasks before him, Mr Matsuura reiterated his firm commitment to the ideals of the World Heritage Convention. (His speech is included as Annex II.6 to this report).

## **IV. REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN SINCE THE TWENTY-FIRST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**IV.1** Mr Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, reported in his capacity as Secretary of the Committee on the activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the twenty-first session of the World Heritage Committee. He referred to Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.5 and made an audiovisual presentation. In this presentation he highlighted the salient activities of the Secretariat.

**IV.2** The Director of the Centre stated that with the adhesion of Togo, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Grenada and Botswana, the number of States Parties has increased to 156. In spite of the growing universality of the Convention, a significant number of UNESCO Members States have yet to sign the Convention, notably twelve from Sub-Saharan Africa, three from the Arab States, ten from the Asia-Pacific, two from Europe and four from the Latin America and the Caribbean.

**IV.3** In terms of nominations, the Director indicated that an analysis of new nominations and tentative lists demonstrates that the problem of regional imbalance will aggravate if the present trend continues. Of the 35 nominations to be reviewed by the Committee at this session, there is not a single property in Africa and only one site in the Arab States. In fact, the vast majority is from Europe. For 1999, there are 89 new nominations, breaking all records of the past. This poses a very serious problem, testing the capacities of ICOMOS and IUCN, as well as the Secretariat, Bureau and the Committee in giving each case the attention it merits. This points to the necessity of rationalizing the working methods.

**IV.4** Efforts to rectify the imbalances and to make the World Heritage List more representative, the Director mentioned, were being made through several regional expert meetings. Particular reference was made of the Global Strategy expert meeting held in Amsterdam in March 1998 to review the criteria and the conditions of authenticity and integrity, the details of which are provided in Documents WHC-98/CONF.203/12 and in WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7 and INF.9.

**IV.5** The attention of the Committee was drawn to Africa 2009, a programme organized jointly by the Centre, ICCROM and CRATerre-EAG. This programme is a regional training strategy for sub-Saharan Africa developed by the three organizations to build capacity for conservation of immovable cultural heritage in the region. This type of capacity building and training is considered to be essential to encourage greater participation of the region in World Heritage matters.

**IV.6** The Director also referred to the Intergovernmental Consultation Conference on the Draft European Landscape Convention, held in Florence in April 1998, as a regional effort in



collaboration with the Council of Europe, to identify and protect the landscapes of Europe.

**IV.7** Stressing the importance of ensuring the World Heritage sites in a satisfactory state of conservation, the Director referred to the decision of the 29<sup>th</sup> General Conference of UNESCO regarding the periodic reporting on World Heritage sites by the States Parties and also to the reactive monitoring reports which are being submitted to the Committee in increasing numbers. While the twenty-first session of the Committee examined 74 state of conservation reports in 1997, there are reports on 98 sites put before this session of the Committee.

**IV.8** To enhance the capacities of the statutory bodies, the advisory bodies and the Secretariat, the question of information management was addressed in March 1998 at an expert group meeting held at UNESCO Headquarters which resulted in a number of recommendations provided in Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15.

**IV.9** The Director then referred to the growing threats to World Heritage, notably by citing the emergency cases brought to the attention of the Secretariat caused by natural and man-made disasters. The serious threats to Kakadu National Park in Australia from the uranium mining proposal and the evaluation mission led by the outgoing Chairperson was mentioned in particular. The hurricanes in the Caribbean, the disaster at Doñana National Park in Spain, civil unrest in Butrinti, Albania, as well as the problem caused by uncontrolled development in the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal and Islamic Cairo, Egypt, were also among the cases cited.

**IV.10** The growing problem of cultural heritage conservation in urban areas was mentioned by the Director in the context of the International Conference for the Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union held in Suzhou, China in April 1998. He referred to the potential of international co-operation between local authorities as demonstrated in this Conference and in projects between other countries in Asia and Europe (Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.12).

**IV.11** Turning to the need to widen partnerships between stakeholders, he stated the importance of enhancing the role of local communities in World Heritage management, and informed the Committee of the regional meeting held at Hua Kha Khoung in Thailand in January 1998 to promote this aspect. The report is being published.

**IV.12** As a means to broaden partnerships, he mentioned the external evaluation conducted on the activities of the Nordic World Heritage Office (NWHO) and commended its work in expanding international co-operation (Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.14). He also requested the Delegate of Canada who participated in the evaluation exercise to inform about the results. She confirmed the recommendation that the mandate of the NWHO be extended for another three years, at which time a more substantive evaluation could and should be undertaken.

**IV.13** In reporting on the implementation of the international assistance provided from the World Heritage Fund, he recalled the importance attached by the Committee to the use of the World Heritage Fund in a catalytic manner to generate local, national and international support for the conservation of World Heritage sites. In this regard, the Director stressed that public information work was an essential part of the World Heritage conservation process to raise the awareness and support for world heritage among opinion leaders and the public at large. He referred to the wide range of information activities being undertaken by the Secretariat, citing in particular the television documentary series and production of publications in partnership

with media groups in many countries. He noted that the Centre's World Heritage web site which was redesigned this year to facilitate navigation and linkage to the World Heritage Information Network (WHIN) partners, is now receiving some 30,000 hits per week, or over one million per year.

**IV.14** As part of the Secretariat's report, the Committee was informed that a second international World Heritage Youth Forum had been held in Osaka, Japan, from 22 to 29 November 1998, hosted by the Osaka Junior Chamber, Inc. and co-organized by UNESCO. Two students and one teacher from sixteen countries: Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Croatia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Japan, Lebanon, Malawi, Norway, Romania, Senegal and Zimbabwe, participated. The participants, selected with the assistance of the UNESCO National Commissions of the respective countries, produced two pledges, one by the students, "Patrimono's Pledge" and the other by the teachers, adopted by the Second International World Heritage Youth Forum. The student pledge was read to the Committee by one of the students, Mr Rangarirai Mlamba of Zimbabwe, on behalf of all the students.

**IV.15** The Chairperson informed the Committee that the World Heritage Education Kit, prepared by the World Heritage Centre in co-operation with UNESCO's Education Sector has been finalized with financial support from the Rhône Poulenc Foundation and NORAD. The Kit entitled "World Heritage in Young Hands", prepared in English and French in a total of 4,000 copies, will be distributed to UNESCO Associated Schools in all regions of the world on an experimental basis. After its final evaluation and modification if necessary, the final version will also be translated into other languages.

**IV.16** The Chairperson handed a copy of the Kit to the representatives of the Youth Forum. He thanked the Director of the Centre and remarked on the impressive range of activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre.

## **V. REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR ON THE SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU**

**V.1** The Rapporteur of the twenty-second regular (June 1998) and twenty-second extraordinary (November 1998) sessions, Mr Noel Fatal, presented the reports contained in Working Documents WHC-98/CONF.203/4 and WHC-98/CONF.203/5. He informed the Bureau that a letter from the Tunisian authorities was received requesting that the word "reservoir" be replaced by "dam" in the text concerning Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia). The Delegate of Thailand indicated that in the report of the twenty-second session of the Bureau (page 19) under the section on the state of conservation of the Historic Areas of Istanbul, the sense of his intervention is not fully reported. He asked that the following sentence be added: "However, the undertaking of the EU-funded feasibility study under discussion is legitimate, if, as pointed out by the Secretariat, the project covers the buffer zone of the World Heritage site."

**V.2** The Rapporteur then thanked the Bureau members and the Secretariat for their collaboration and stated the need for reflection on the format of the Bureau reports in view of the increasing volume and complexity of the content.

**V.3** Before proceeding to Item 6, the Chairperson informed the Committee of the presence of the representatives of the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank as observers at a Committee session for the first time. Expressing his appreciation for the interest of these agencies in the World Heritage Convention, he indicated the necessity of integrating

conservation in the sustainable development process, as stipulated in Article 5 of the Convention. The Chairperson drew the attention of the Committee to Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.12, Report on Activities for World Heritage Cities in Asia, which discusses the important issue of heritage conservation and development.

## **GUEST SPEAKERS**

The Chairperson invited Mr. Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President for Special Programmes of The World Bank, to address the Committee. Mr. Serageldin brought greetings from Mr. James D. Wolfenson, President of the World Bank, and underscored the Bank's commitment to partner all those concerned with the preservation of cultural heritage within the context of sustainable development. In his speech, Mr. Serageldin outlined three areas in which the Bank will systematize its support to culture: (1) conceptual; (2) technical and financial support for the protection of the cultural heritage; and (3) partnerships with other international organizations, the private sector and civil society. He welcomed the delegates to an exhibition by The World Bank on the theme of "Heritage at Risk" which is being held at the Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto. Mr. Serageldin said that The World Bank is willing to finance operations in support of conserving the World Heritage sites, provided that these are imbedded in a broader developmental endeavour. He stressed the importance of community and stakeholder involvement and a participatory approach in all efforts to integrate conservation and development. His speech is attached as Annex II.7.

The Chairperson then invited Mr. Nalin P. Samarasinghe, Resident Representative in Japan of the Asian Development Bank to take the floor. In his speech, Mr. Samarasinghe provided information about the Asian Development Bank. He also examined the Asian Development Bank's strategic objectives relating them to the objectives of the World Heritage Committee. Giving examples of what the Asian Development Bank has done to promote World Heritage conservation, he stressed the Bank's recognition of the need to preserve cultural and natural heritage sites as common resources of the world. The Asian Development Bank supports projects that aim to generate employment opportunities and income from heritage resources without destroying them in the process; projects such as forestry and fisheries management, and eco-tourism. He also said the Asian Development Bank shared the Committee's view of the importance of World Heritage education. He explained the Asian Development Bank's policy regarding the importance of undertaking environmental impact assessments as a part of the planning of all projects which the Asian Development Bank considers for funding. He underscored that these assessments take into consideration the effect of the proposed projects on World Heritage sites as well as on their indigenous inhabitants. Specific examples of heritage conservation projects which the Asian Development Bank has funded include environmental rehabilitation in Agra (Taj Mahal), airport development in Siem Reap (Angkor), and sustainable tourism in Nepal. His speech is attached as Annex II.8.

## **VI. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC REPORTING**

**VI.1** The Secretariat introduced Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6. It pointed out that this document referred to the periodic reporting by the States Parties under Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention and did not include considerations on the reactive monitoring that is foreseen for reporting on World Heritage properties that are under threat. It informed the Committee that this document had been discussed by the Bureau at its twenty-second session. Reference was also made to Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16 that included the corresponding revision of Section II of the Operational Guidelines.

**VI.2** During the debate, numerous Committee members commended the Secretariat for the work accomplished and expressed general agreement with the proposals made.

**VI.3** Committee members expressed strong support for the regional approach and the development of regional strategies for the periodic reporting process, as proposed in the Working Document, as a means to respond to the specific characteristics of the regions and to promote regional collaboration.

**VI.4** As to the periodicity of the reporting, the Committee agreed to a six-year cycle. It decided that in the first reporting cycle those properties should be reported upon that were inscribed up to eight years before the examination of the reports by the Committee.

**VI.5** The Committee, furthermore, stressed the important role the States Parties themselves, as well as the advisory bodies and other organizations should play in the periodic reporting process, in the development of the regional strategies and in the review of the reports submitted by the States Parties.

**VI.6** Several delegates referred to the future workload for the Secretariat, the advisory bodies and the Committee and requested that this be carefully considered in the planning of the work of the Centre and the advisory bodies, as well as in the management of the agenda of the Committee.

**VI.7** The Committee, having examined Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6 and the corresponding Section of Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16, adopted the following decision:

A. Following the request made by the 29<sup>th</sup> General Conference of UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee:

- (a) Invites States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to submit, in accordance with Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention and the decisions of the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties and the 29<sup>th</sup> General Conference of UNESCO, periodic reports on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the World Heritage Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories;
- (b) Invites States Parties to submit periodic reports every six years using the format for periodic reports as adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session;
- (c) Expresses its wish to examine the States Parties' periodic reports region by region. This will include the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List according to the following table:



Region	Examination of Properties inscribed up to and including	Year of examination by Committee
Arab States	1992	2000
Africa	1993	2001
Asia and the Pacific	1994	2002
Latin America and the Caribbean	1995	2003
Europe and North America	1996/1997	2004/2005

- (d) Requests the Secretariat, jointly with the advisory bodies, and making use of States Parties, competent institutions and expertise available within the region, to develop regional strategies for the periodic reporting process as per the above-mentioned time table, and to present them with budgetary proposals for their implementation to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee for consideration and adoption. These strategies should respond to specific characteristics of the regions and should promote coordination and synchronization between States Parties, particularly in the case of transboundary properties.

B. As to the format for the periodic reports, the Committee adopted the proposal made in Annex I of Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6, with the following revisions:

Section II.1. to read as follows :

"II.1 Introduction

- a. State Party
- b. Name of World Heritage property
- c. Geographical co-ordinates
- d. Date of inscription on the World Heritage List
- e. Organization(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of the report
- f. Date of report
- g. Signature on behalf of State Party"

Section II, item II.3. to read as follows :

"II.3. Statement of authenticity/integrity"

Section II, item II.7. to read as follows :

"II.7. Conclusions and recommended action

- a. Main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above)
- b. Main conclusions regarding the management and factors affecting the property (see Items II.4 and II.5. above)
- c. Proposed future actions
- d. Responsible implementing agency/agencies
- e. Timeframe for implementation
- f. Needs for international assistance."

C. As to the explanatory notes that will be attached to the format for periodic reports, the Committee adopted the proposals made in Annex I of Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/6, with the following revisions:

II.2. Statement of Significance, paragraph four to be read as follows:

"If a statement of significance is not available or incomplete, it will be necessary, in the first periodic report, for the State Party to propose such a statement. The statement of significance should reflect the criterion (criteria) on the basis of which the Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List. It should also address questions such as: What does the property represent, what makes the property outstanding, what are the specific values that distinguish the property, what is the relationship of the site with its setting, etc. Such statement of significance will be examined by the advisory body(ies) concerned and transmitted to the World Heritage Committee for approval, if appropriate ."

II.4. Management, paragraphs one and two to be read as follows:

"Under this item, it is necessary to report on the implementation and effectiveness of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level and/or contractual or traditional protection as well as of management and/or planning control for the property concerned, as well as on actions that are foreseen for the future, to preserve the values described in the statement of significance under item II.2.

The State Party should also report on significant changes in the ownership, legal status and/or contractual or traditional protective measures, management arrangements and management plans as compared to the situation at the time of inscription or the previous periodic report. In such case, the State Party is requested to attach to the periodic report all relevant documentation, in particular legal texts, management plans and/or (annual) work plans for the management and maintenance of the property. Full name and address of the agency or person directly responsible for the property should also be provided."

D. The Committee adopted the revision of Section II of the Operational Guidelines as submitted in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16, including the amendments made above.

**VI.8** The format for periodic reports and explanatory notes as adopted by the World Heritage Committee is attached in Annex III.

## **VII. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

### **A. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**VII.1** The Committee examined reports on the state of conservation of twenty-two properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger as submitted in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/7 and complemented with information provided by the Secretariat and the advisory bodies during the session.

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **VII.2 Srebarna Nature Reserve (Bulgaria)**

At its nineteenth session (Berlin, 1995) the Committee had requested the Bulgarian authorities to submit a threat mitigation status report to its twenty-second session in 1998. The Bulgarian authorities submitted the report requested by the Committee on Srebarna Nature Reserve, on 28 August 1998, and invited the Centre and IUCN to field a mission to verify the results of measures undertaken to mitigate threats to the integrity of Srebarna. A team consisting of one specialist each from IUCN and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, and a consultant representing the Centre, visited Srebarna and Sofia, Bulgaria, from 1 to 6 October 1998.

The Committee reviewed a summary of the report submitted by the mission team, which included: (i) a brief description of Srebarna's World Heritage values; (ii) causes which led to the decline in Srebarna's ecology and state of conservation and its inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992; (iii) principal findings concerning the results of rehabilitation measures implemented by the Bulgarian authorities; and (iv) proposals for recommendations to be made by the Committee to the State Party.

The Committee recalled that Srebarna Nature Reserve was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983. This 602 ha. fresh water site on the flood plain of the Danube River was acknowledged to be of regional and global significance under criterion (iv) of the 1983 Operational Guidelines; i.e. geological and physiographic formations and precisely outlined areas which are habitats of species threatened by extinction, and of plant or animal species with extraordinary and universal value from the point of view of science, nature protection or natural beauty. The site was of particular significance as a nesting site for the Dalmatian pelican, ferruginous duck, the pygmy cormorant and corncrake.

Srebarna was disconnected from the Danube in 1949 by the construction of a dike between the lake and the river. Engineering efforts in 1979 to mitigate the impacts of the dike construction were not successful. Between 1985 and 1990, the adverse impacts of a protracted drought in the Balkan peninsula, and the cumulative impacts of historical and recent anthropogenic influences became more readily observable in the deteriorating ecological conditions of Srebarna. The latter causal agents and the regulation of annual Danube flood crests by the Romanian Iron Gates control structure led to decreasing inundation of Srebarna by the Danube waters. The introduction of modern agricultural practices (chemical fertilizers and insecticides) and the increase in domestic animal populations in the surrounding arable drainage area also led to net adverse results. These results include increased levels of dissolved nitrogen and phosphate, and

sedimentation and turbidity, decreased water column and lake volume, increased primary productivity and significant changes in the structure of phytoplankton populations. An acceleration of eutrophication and the transition of Srebarna from a lake to a marsh, the decline of biodiversity (particularly fish species), the diminished use of the area by rare and threatened resident and migratory bird species, and reduced nesting success ratios of key breeding bird species of World Heritage significance was also noted. At its sixteenth session in 1992, the Committee included Srebarna Nature Reserve in the List of World Heritage in Danger; in 1993, Srebarna was placed on the Montreux Record, a register of sites in need of priority conservation action in the implementation of the Ramsar Convention.

In 1995, the Committee examined a state of conservation report from the State Party which indicated that a canal, linking the Danube and Srebarna for the first time since 1949, had been successfully established with bilateral assistance from the US Agency for International Development (USAID), and was operational with control structures. A permanent Reserve Administration had been established and intensive monitoring studies were ongoing. In 1996, the Committee examined a monitoring report prepared by the Ramsar Secretariat indicating that the new canal and water control structure were operational allowing water into Srebarna Lake. It also indicated that the Dalmatian pelican nesting colony had been re-established at levels higher than that found at the time of Srebarna's inscription on the World Heritage List in 1983. In 1997, a 35,000SF allocation from the Ramsar Small Grants Fund (1997), enabled the initiation of the preparation of a management plan for Srebarna.

The Committee was pleased to learn that the team that undertook the mission from 1 to 6 October 1998 had been able to observe continuing improvements in the state of conservation of Srebarna. The team concluded that significant affirmative actions and investments have been made by the Bulgarian authorities to investigate, analyse and mitigate threats to Srebarna's World Heritage values. In particular, the mission team noted the following positive results:

A. The re-establishment of an operational, seasonal connection between the Danube and the Srebarna Lake and surrounding wetlands has resulted in an increase in the water volume and water column, dilution and/or reduction of dissolved nitrogen and phosphate levels and lowered turbidity; phytoplankton populations have been re-established and their structure stabilised and fish species diversity had increased to pre-inscription (1983) levels;

B. The 1998 breeding success ratio of the nesting colony of Dalmatian pelicans significantly exceeded 1980s average population levels; 80 breeding pairs produced 99 successfully fledged chicks, registering a marked improvement over success ratios recorded for any period since Srebarna's recognition as World Heritage. The sixty breeding pairs of pygmy cormorant also reflect a similar significant key species response to more favourable ecological conditions now present. Other globally significant and rare water bird species including the corncrake and ferruginous duck, have also responded in a positive manner.

C. Administratively, significant legislation (Draft Protected Areas Act - No. 802-01-16) has been promulgated by the Ministry of Environment and Waters (MoEW), approved by the Council of Ministers, and is under a second review in the National Assembly. The intent of this legislation is to strengthen conservation in Bulgaria in general and harmonize Bulgarian protected area classification with international standards, including relevant European Union Directives. Elements of the draft legislation have a particular relevance to the continuing

recognition of Srebarna, as a "strict" nature reserve where activities other than scientific research are excluded.

D. A small but competent staff has been established for the Srebarna Nature Reserve management and is currently co-operating well with the Academy of Science on ongoing monitoring activities; an automated weather recording facility is in place and will facilitate monitoring activities. Both management staff and Academy researchers appear on excellent terms with local community leadership that would be necessary to establish effective co-operation for the management of the buffer zone. Although the necessary integrated management planning process has been initiated, the final draft of the plan may still be 18 months away and does not appear to adequately involve public participation, or to address ethno-historical and socio-economic considerations. The plan outline may not necessarily translate into an action plan in its current form.

In the light of the significant improvements in the state of conservation of Srebarna, the Committee:

1. Commended the State Party for the efforts undertaken to restore Srebarna's environment and World Heritage values to 1983 standards;
2. Encouraged the State Party to accelerate the interdisciplinary management planning and threat mitigation efforts and continue to pursue intensive monitoring to assure continued ecological restoration so that the area may be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger when it can be demonstrated that recovery appears sustainable;
3. Encouraged the State Party to seek the necessary co-operation with Romania to assure that the feeding areas and flyways for the Srebarna breeding Dalmatian pelican population are offered safe haven, and based on the terms of the World Heritage Convention (Article 6.3), to establish a more favourable hydraulic regime of the Danube River;
4. Encouraged the State Party to actively participate in regional and international scientific, and management exchanges to further benefit the management of all the Danube River wetland resources;
5. Encouraged the State Party to explore the ways and means to collaborate with other States Parties sharing resident and migratory bird species and populations to collectively consider a composite transboundary "Danube Wetland World Heritage Site", to link and embrace all suitable and qualified areas which collectively represent a globally significant and outstanding natural and cultural resource.

The Committee will consider removing Srebarna from the List of World Heritage in Danger upon the passage of the pending Draft Protected Areas Act (No. 802-01-16) or substantively similar conservation legislation, the satisfactory and timely completion of the Srebarna Management Plan together with the establishment of effective resource and buffer zone management regimes compatible with restoring and maintaining World Heritage values, and the provision of data to support indices of sustained World Heritage value recovery through to the year 2000. To this effect the Committee suggested that the State Party:

- (i) involve the local community and NGO representation in the management planning process and in the formulation of specific co-operative actions which may be required in the management of the buffer zone and the adjacent Lake Srebarna drainage area;
- (ii) consider acquiring additional scientific data and information including ethno-historical and palaeo-botanical analysis of lake sediments prior to dredging

activity, and to complete aerial-photographic records for management planning;

- (iii) develop a Srebarna Action Plan establishing management and environmental education, interpretation priorities and requirements to supplement the Srebarna Management Plan as outlined; and
- (iv) continue to participate in the implementation of activities that mutually support the objectives of the World Heritage Convention, Ramsar Convention, and the Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB).

### **VII.3 Manovo-Gounda-St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic (CAR))**

The Committee, at its last session (Naples, 1997), was seriously concerned about the uncontrolled poaching by armed groups which had led to the death of four members of the Park staff, decimated more than 80% of the Park's wildlife populations and brought tourism to a halt. The Committee had welcomed the efforts of the Government of CAR to assign site management responsibilities to a private Foundation and had requested the Centre and IUCN to contact the State Party and the Foundation to prepare a detailed state of conservation report and a rehabilitation plan for the site. The Committee noted that the State Party had not responded to the Centre's letter outlining the Committee's recommendations mentioned above.

The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to write to the President of the CAR inviting his urgent intervention for the preparation of a detailed state of conservation report and a rehabilitation plan for the conservation of this site.

### **VII.4 World Heritage sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC):**

#### **Virunga National Park Garamba National Park Kahuzi Biega National Park Okapi Faunal Reserve**

The Committee had declared these four sites as World Heritage in Danger, during 1994-1997, as war and civil strife have ravaged the country. The Committee noted that the Bureau, at its twenty-second ordinary session (June 1998), had been of the view that the security situation in the country may be improving. Hence, the Bureau had encouraged the Centre to continue its efforts, in co-operation with international conservation NGOs, to ensure the purchase and safe delivery of one four-wheel drive vehicle to each of the four sites, in accordance with the decision of the Committee made at its last session (Naples, 1997).

Since June 1998 however, the law and order situation in the country has unfortunately deteriorated once again, and renewed fighting has spread to all parts of the country. A strategic planning workshop for the conservation and management of Garamba National Park, which was to be held in Kinshasa in August 1998 under the auspices of WWF had to be indefinitely postponed. Frequency of rhino sightings in Garamba have dropped and numbers of several large herbivores remain below their 1995 population levels. In the Okapi Faunal Reserve, equipment donated by international conservation NGOs has been looted and staff who were in the process of reviving conservation activities evacuated. In Kahuzi Biega, WWF Project staff was withdrawn due to worsening security conditions in the area and the Tshibanga Station has been looted. In Virunga human encroachment has been detected along Lake Edouard. Park guards no longer carry any weapons, and require military escort to patrol the Park and have not been paid their salaries for nearly two years. "Motivation allowances" paid to guards in the

southern sector of Virunga by the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) had been stopped as the donor, i.e. UNHCR, withdrew its support to the scheme. IGCP and the national conservation authority, Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN) have prepared a strategic action plan and are seeking funds for Park personnel. IGCP has agreed to distribute any financial support received to all sectors of the Virunga National Park. IUCN suggested that the Committee consider providing emergency assistance to pay some allowances to the staff at Virunga.

The Committee noted with concern that the vehicles purchased for Garamba and Kahuzi Biega National Parks could not be transported beyond Nairobi, Kenya, due to lack of security. The Committee requested the Centre to co-operate with WWF, UNDP and the Kenyan Government authorities to ensure the safety of these two vehicles so that they could be delivered to Garamba and Kahuzi-Biega whenever the situation in the eastern parts of the Democratic Republic of the Congo returned to normal. IUCN informed the Committee that the territories in which the four sites are located are controlled by rebel forces and that it is unlikely that missions to any one of the four sites will be feasible in the near future.

The Committee decided to retain all four sites in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested the Centre to freeze all activities related to the purchase and delivery of vehicles to any one of the four sites until such time as security conditions improve. The Committee asked the Centre and IUCN to consult with IGCP and ICCN, to estimate the cost of paying allowances to staff at Virunga National Park as an interim measure and submit a proposal for emergency assistance for the consideration of the twenty-third session of the Bureau in 1999. Furthermore, the Committee suggested that the Centre and IUCN communicate the Committee's concerns for the state of conservation of these four sites to international and national NGOs working in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. These NGOs should be encouraged to disseminate information about the Committee's concerns among the general public as well as specific target groups such as the military.

#### **VII.5 Sangay National Park (Ecuador)**

The Committee, at its last session was informed that colonization and small-scale mining activities had been stopped, a new management plan was nearing finalization and that several conservation projects funded by WWF had begun. The Committee had urged the Centre, in collaboration with IUCN, and agreement with the State Party and possible support from WWF, to plan and organize a site visit to address the problem of the Guamote-Macas road construction project and other threats to the integrity of the site. The Committee was informed that the Bureau, at its twenty-second session in June 1998, had noted that the on-going construction of the Guamote-Macos road was the main threat to this Park and an EIA had not been conducted. Construction has been slow but very destructive to the environment. Only a small section of the road is inside the World Heritage site; the remainder of the road forms the Park's southern limit. The Committee noted that since the conclusion of the last session of the Bureau in June 1998, economic constraints have led to a halt in the activities related to the construction of the Guamote-Macos road. IUCN has noted that a 5-year, US\$ 1.6 million project, financed by the Government of the Netherlands and jointly implemented by WWF and Fundacion Natura, will strengthen protection of the Park.

The Committee was informed that the Ecuadorean authorities have submitted to the Centre several new documents, including the "Strategic Management Plan for the Sangay National Park" immediately before the beginning of the Committee's twenty-second session. The Delegate of Ecuador informed the

Committee that his Government has not issued any permits for oil exploration in Sangay and would welcome a Centre/IUCN mission to the site in 1999. The Committee noted with satisfaction the view of IUCN that conditions for strengthening the conservation of this site were improving and that it is possible that the planned mission in 1999 may recommend its removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger and thanked the Delegate of Ecuador for inviting a Centre/IUCN mission in 1999 to review the state of conservation of Sangay National Park. The Committee requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party and with other partners such as WWF to field such a mission as soon as possible in 1999 with a view to submitting an up-to-date state of conservation report to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

#### **VII.6 Simen National Park (Ethiopia)**

The Committee recalled the fact that the regional authorities in Bahir Dar, where this site is located, had disagreed with its decision to include this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996. The Committee was informed that the Bureau, at its twenty-second session (June 1998) had noted with satisfaction the efforts of the Department of Wildlife and National Parks of Ethiopia and the UNESCO Office in Addis Ababa, to provide more information to the Bahir Dar authorities on the meaning and implications of the Committee's decision to include Simen National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee took note of the fact that a stakeholders' meeting had been convened in Gondar on 24-25 June 1998, and that the responsibilities for the management of the Park had been transferred from the Central Authorities to the region. The meeting had led to the formation of a 'dialogue-group' of various national and regional offices to discuss follow-up activities for the conservation of the Park. The meeting had called for the organization of a second stakeholders' seminar, before June 1999, in collaboration with UNDP, Austria, UNESCO, UNCDF, Bahir Dar Regional Heads and donors, to follow-up on the outcome of the first meeting held in June 1998. The objectives of the second stakeholders' meeting would be to establish a strategy for:

- (i) minimizing the human population inside the Park, estimated at 8-10,000 people at present;
- (ii) rehabilitation of the Park and re-establishing populations of selected species, like the Walia Ibex which have moved out of the Park due to human presence and the cultivation of considerable areas of the Park;
- (iii) creation of an alternative to a road which currently goes through the Park; and
- (iv) establishment of a framework for co-ordination, including the possible setting up of an Inter-Agency Committee where donor participation will be invited, for the sustainable development of the Simen Mountains ecosystem.

The Committee recalled the fact that it had approved a sum of US\$ 30,000 in 1996 for the organization of a stakeholders' meeting for the conservation of Simen which had not been utilized because the Regional authorities in Bahir Dar had disagreed with the Committee's decision to include the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger at that time. The Committee requested the Centre and IUCN to consult with the Ethiopian authorities regarding the use of the US\$ 30,000 from the 1999 budget of the World Heritage Fund, either for the organization of the second stakeholders' meeting or for other strategic planning activities pertaining to the conservation and management of this

site. The Committee decided to retain Simen National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.7 Mount Nimba Nature Reserve (Guinea/ Côte d'Ivoire)**

The Committee, at its last session (Naples, 1997), had requested the State Party (Guinea) and the Centre to contact the relevant mining companies, which foresee the exploitation of an iron-ore mine in the vicinity of the Reserve, in order to learn more details of their interest to set up an international foundation for the conservation of Mt. Nimba. The Committee was informed of a letter dated 20 September 1998, from the Permanent Executive Secretary of the MAB National Committee for Guinea informing the Centre that the Nimba Mining Company (NIMCO) has been dissolved by the Government and no other enterprise has been created to replace it.

The Committee noted that the establishment of a foundation or a trust fund for the conservation of Mt. Nimba appears increasingly unlikely in the immediate future. The Committee agreed with IUCN's observation that on-site information on the state of conservation of Mt. Nimba had not been updated for about three years. It accepted IUCN's offer to request its Regional Office for West Africa in Burkina Faso to undertake a mission, at the invitation of States Parties concerned, in order to prepare a state of conservation report for submission to the twenty-third session of the Committee. The Committee decided to retain Mt. Nimba in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.8 Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)**

The Committee recalled the fact that it included this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996, and requested the State Party to implement the eleven-point corrective action plan that had been endorsed by the Minister for the Environment of Honduras. The elaboration of a management plan for Rio Platano is being carried out with a contribution of US\$ 30,000 from the World Heritage Fund, as part of a large scale project for strengthening the conservation of Rio Platano financed by GTZ-KFW (Germany). The Committee was informed of a hydroelectric development project (Patuca II), proposed for implementation near the Reserve. Terms of reference for a draft environmental impact assessment of the development project have been prepared; potential impacts of the project include opening of new access roads to the Reserve, reduction in downstream water flow and quality, and the loss of scenic and bio-diversity values. The Committee noted that IUCN has received a large number of reports on the hydroelectric development project, reflecting in particular the concern and disagreement of a number of indigenous peoples living in and around the area. According to these reports, the Government is promoting the rapid implementation of this project, and the process for preparing an EIA, currently underway, lacks consultation and transparency. Reports received also indicate a plan for opening a new road. Furthermore, the Committee noted that communications with relevant authorities in Honduras have become difficult following recent damages caused to the country's infrastructure by Hurricane Mitch and information on the damage caused by the hurricane to this site need to be urgently obtained.

The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee requested the Centre to contact the State Party to obtain detailed information on the proposed hydroelectric development project, including on EIA which is currently under preparation, as well as on the impact of Hurricane Mitch on Rio Platano. Moreover, the Committee requested the State Party to invite the Centre and IUCN to undertake a site visit with a view to providing a detailed state of

conservation report on Rio Platano to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

#### **VII.9 Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India)**

The Committee was informed that the implementation of the rehabilitation plan for this site, approved at the twenty-second session of the Bureau (June 1997), was progressing satisfactorily. All equipment purchased using the first instalment of US\$ 75,000 approved under emergency assistance by the Bureau in June 1997, has been delivered to the site. The Committee agreed to the use of the small sum of unspent balance from the US\$ 75,000 (i.e. US\$ 872) by the UNESCO Office in New Delhi for a site-visit to Manas in early 1999. Construction of range posts and staff housing to be undertaken using the second instalment of US\$ 90,000, approved by the Committee as emergency assistance at its last session (Naples, 1997), has however, been delayed due to adverse climatic conditions in the area throughout 1998, but is expected to gather momentum in 1999.

The Committee noted that while security conditions in and around Manas have improved, the threat of insurgency still prevails in the State of Assam and militants often traversed the Sanctuary. Nevertheless, the Committee was informed that the Indian authorities were of the view that conditions for site-protection and the relationship with local villagers were gradually improving. The Committee noted the fact that the Indian authorities had provided US\$ 400,000 to strengthen the conservation of Manas during 1997-98 and provided an additional US\$ 100,000 in 1998. Additional contributions will be considered for disbursement as soon as the funds provided so far are utilized in accordance with plans agreed upon by the Ministry of Environment and Forests in New Delhi, the State Government of Assam and site management.

The Committee decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Centre to continue monitoring the progress in the implementation of the rehabilitation plan for this site. Furthermore, the Committee decided to request the Director-General of UNESCO to invite the Government of Bhutan to ratify the World Heritage Convention and to consider nominating the Royal Manas National Park of Bhutan for consideration by the Committee for World Heritage status. The Committee noted that this could help to strengthen the overall protection of the trans-border Manas ecosystem.

#### **VII.10 Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)**

The Committee at its twentieth (Merida, 1996) and twenty-first (Naples, 1997) sessions had called for a site visit to evaluate the state of conservation in order to determine whether the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee was pleased to note that the findings of the Centre/State Party/IUCN mission to the site, undertaken from 21 September to 3 October 1998, and those of previous exploratory field missions of the IUCN Office in Niger undertaken with the assistance of the Swiss Development Co-operation (SDC), have indicated that the numbers of most wildlife species are recovering. The flora appears to be intact in most parts, except in some valleys where over-use by local people was noted. Some wildlife species like the ostrich however, continue to be seriously threatened by poaching and international trade in live animals and its by-products. Population size of ostrich in the Reserves has been found to be less than 10% of the 1990-91 estimates. IUCN Niger has progressed in the preparation of a new programme, in co-operation with SDC and DANIDA, for the conservation of the area, with the aim of establishing conditions for conservation of the Reserves and decentralized sustainable use initiatives. The programme will attempt to increase the economic value of the

Reserves to local communities through eco-tourism, agriculture and animal husbandry.

The Committee noted with satisfaction that the Peace Agreement signed between the Government and rebels has been effectively implemented. Impact of rebel activities in the area on the integrity of the site has been less severe than expected. Furthermore, the Committee was informed that the State Party has submitted an emergency programme for the rehabilitation of the site which foresees the implementation of the following activities: (i) restoration of sites which were used as bases by the rebels in the past; (ii) strengthening surveillance and protection capacity; (iii) ostrich breeding in partially enclosed areas; (iv) rapid evaluation of impacts on populations of key faunal species; (v) establishment of a Committee for development and management of the site; and (vi) training workshops for selected target groups like border police, customs officers etc., on threats to natural heritage. The Committee noted that detailed proposals for each of these activities need to be elaborated in consultation with possible donors, such as UNDP so as to ensure their rapid implementation.

The Committee commended the State Party for ensuring the protection of this site in spite of rebel activity and uncertain security conditions and welcomed the interest of SDC, DANIDA, UNDP and other donors to contribute to the conservation of this site. The Committee requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party and all other stakeholders to explore modalities for financing the implementation of the emergency rehabilitation plan and to identify priority activities for consideration of support from the World Heritage Fund. The Committee requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to submit to the twenty-third session of the Bureau, a plan of action for implementing the emergency rehabilitation programme and a recommendation as to whether the Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-third session in 1999.

#### **VII.11 Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia)**

The Committee inscribed Ichkeul National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996 and requested the Tunisian authorities to provide a programme of corrective measures to reverse the degradation of the site. The Committee was informed that the Bureau, at its twenty-second ordinary session (June 1998), received a report from IUCN, which provided technical data to indicate that the salinity of the water in the lake may have reached excessively high proportions and that the chances of recovery of the World Heritage values of the site may be fast receding. IUCN expressed its concern at the slow pace and effectiveness of the implementation of the rehabilitation programme by the State Party.

The Committee noted that the Observer of Tunisia had informed the Bureau of several measures undertaken by his Government to retain freshwater in the lakes on a year-round basis and thereby reduce salinity of the lake. He had described other measures taken for providing: (i) irrigation and water supply needs of the population; (ii) economic incentives to reduce the dependence on the resources of the nearby mountain which constitutes part of an area from where the waters drain into the lake; and (iii) monitoring the number of migratory birds in Ichkeul during the European winter. The Observer of Tunisia had disagreed with some of the data presented by IUCN to the Bureau.

The Committee noted that the Bureau, while being concerned regarding the feasibility of effectively rehabilitating this site and urging the State Party to take all necessary measures to ensure rapid and effective implementation of the programme for rehabilitating Ichkeul, had also recommended an expert mission to the site. The intention of the Bureau in recommending such an

expert mission was to give due consideration to the possibility for developing an improved rehabilitation programme for Ichkeul and retain its status as a World Heritage site. The Committee agreed with the Bureau's suggestion that the State Party needs to be allowed sufficient time for the implementation of the rehabilitation programme. The Committee noted that the State Party has already invited an expert mission to visit the site in the second half of December 1998.

The Committee decided to retain Ichkeul National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to field the expert mission as soon as possible. The Committee recommended that the Centre and IUCN ensure that the expert mission (i) establish the baseline data and information necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of rehabilitation measures which are being currently implemented; (ii) prepare a report on the adequacy of conservation and rehabilitation measures; and (iii) if necessary, propose additional measures that may be needed for the conservation of the site. The Committee requested the Centre to submit a report of the expert mission for review by the twenty-third session of the Bureau, and invited the State Party to provide a comprehensive report on the results of the implementation of the rehabilitation measures to the twenty-third session of the Committee, in 1999.

#### **VII.12 Everglades National Park (United States of America)**

At its last session (Naples, 1997), the Committee noted significant progress made in the state of conservation of this site following generous Federal and State allocations of financial and human resources. The Delegate of the United States of America provided a detailed state of conservation report on this site, which outlined important measures undertaken to ensure continuing progress in the restoration of this site. In particular, the Committee noted the following:

- (i) US\$ 26 million worth of land purchases have been completed in the East Everglades Expansion Area; an additional US\$ 40 million are needed to finalize the total of 109,000 acres of additional land purchases foreseen as part of the programme to expand the total extent of the Everglades National Park;
- (ii) The western population of the cape sable seaside sparrow has suffered from abnormally prolonged wet periods which had been created by water management structures that artificially keep waters in the western Shark Slough in order to keep the eastern parts dry. Flooding denies the sparrow access to its nesting sites, found only in the transitional grasslands of the western Shark Slough. Restoration of water flows to the eastern Shark Slough is a high priority measure for the restoration of the overall Everglades ecosystem and will serve the interests of the sparrow as well. Everglades National Park and the Fish and Wildlife Services are planning water diversions to the Eastern Shark Slough. Fortunate dry weather conditions coincided with the nesting season of the sparrow in April 1998 and enabled breeding success comparable to the previous year;
- (iii) Legislation has been introduced in the US Congress that would permanently retain the presence of the Miccosukee Tribe within the Everglades National Park. Any agreement for providing a site for the Tribe's continued practice of its living culture may come into conflict with the restoration of water flows through the eastern Shark Slough (where the Miccosukee Tribe is located), considered to be an essential measure for the restoration of the overall Everglades ecosystem.



The Delegate of the United States informed the Committee that despite significant progress in acquiring land, and allocating financial and human resources necessary for the restoration of the Everglades, the US Government believes that the site continues to be in Danger. In response to a question raised by IUCN as to how the State Party would determine when the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the United States Delegate pointed that success measures to determine effects of the restoration activities are being developed and will be reported to the Committee in due course.

The Committee agreed to the request of the State Party and decided to retain this site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.13 Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)**

At its last session (Naples, 1997), the Committee noted that the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Lands and Minerals Management and the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Natural Resources and the Environment had both signed, on 12 August 1997, the decision authorizing the withdrawal of mineral entry from 22,065 ha near Cooke City, Montana. The potential threat due to the extraction of the New World Mine by Crown Butte was thus mitigated. The Delegate of the United States of America informed the Committee that since then his Government has entered into an additional agreement with Crown Butte to devote US\$ 22.5 million of the US\$ 65 million to clean up contamination from nearly 100 years of mining near Yellowstone. The New World Mine property was formally transferred to the US Forest Service on 12 August 1998; the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have begun developing a plan to remedy historic mine impacts.

A potential threat to Yellowstone's bison population arises from the concerns of the livestock regulatory officials that free-ranging bison might transmit brucellosis to domestic cattle on private and public lands outside the Park. These concerns have resulted in a law-suit being brought against the National Park Service in 1995, and created pressure on the Park authorities to develop an interim plan which, amongst other measures, foresaw the capture and slaughter of bison which are infected with the disease both within and outside of the Park. Given that the capture and slaughter outrages the public, bison management is likely to remain contentious. The work of the Greater Yellowstone Interagency Committee is facilitating information exchange among several state and federal agencies and is addressing various issues regarding brucellosis in wildlife, notably bison and elk. The purchase of 15,000 acres of critical areas of the bison's winter range, in November 1998, may contribute further towards the development of a long-term bison management plan that would minimize the need for widespread slaughter witnessed in the winter of 1997.

The ascertained threat to the Yellowstone cutthroat trout, caused by the invasion of the non-native Yellowstone Lake trout also continues to prevail, despite the fact various mitigation measures are being attempted. A serious decline in the population of cutthroat trout could impact grizzly bears, bald eagle and 40 other mammalian and avian species which feed on the native fish species to some extent. Intensive gill netting and liberal angling regulations have helped to remove more than 6000 non-native trout from the Yellowstone Lake. But netting programmes appear to be affecting adults only and the population of the non-native species could show a resurgence as juveniles enter the fishery.

The Park management continues its efforts to address other ascertained threats to water quality due to leaking wastes and sewage and regulate visitor pressure and improve Park roads to ensure safety of visitors. While the Park management is investigating several options to minimize the impacts of these

threats, progress in implementing remedial actions is slow and the Delegate of the United States informed the Committee that his Government believes that Yellowstone is still in Danger. The Committee agreed with the request of the State Party and decided to retain Yellowstone in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee applauded the exemplary dedication and highest levels of commitment that the US Government has shown in its efforts to mitigate threats to the two sites included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

#### **VII.14 Butrinti (Albania)**

On the basis of a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-Butrint Foundation assessment mission (October 1997), the Committee at its twenty-first session decided to inscribe Butrinti on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to allocate US\$ 100,000 as emergency assistance for the implementation of remedial actions.

The Secretariat reported that arrangements had been made with the Albanian authorities for the implementation of concrete actions, such as an inventory and publication of stolen archaeological objects, purchase of water pumps, improvement of fences, the construction of sanitary facilities and repairs at the museum building and the storage facilities. It also advised the Albanian authorities on the redefinition of the boundaries of the World Heritage site and the establishment of a buffer zone.

The Butrint Foundation organized in April 1998 a workshop to define the guidelines for a master plan and in September 1998 on the presentation and preservation of the baptistery and its extremely well preserved mosaics. The Government of Greece made a high-level expert available for the workshop. Consultations are underway with the European Union, The World Bank and public and private organizations, with a view to incorporate the planning for Butrinti in local and regional planning schemes.

The Government of Albania decided in August 1998 to create an Office for the Protection of the World Heritage Site of Butrinti for co-ordination and implementation of coherent actions for the site.

The Committee commended the Albanian authorities and collaborating institutions on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 1997 assessment mission. It congratulated the Government of Albania for the decision to create the Office for the Protection of the World Heritage Site of Butrinti and encouraged the authorities to provide it with adequate authority and human and financial resources.

The Committee confirmed that it places particular importance on the redefinition of the boundaries and buffer zone of the site, as well as the preparation of a management and master plan.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to submit a report on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 1997 assessment mission to its twenty-third session.

The Committee decided to retain Butrinti on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.15 Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)**

At the request of the World Heritage Committee, the Benin authorities prepared a conservation plan, partly financed by the World Heritage Fund. This conservation plan was developed as

an instrument for co-operation and partnership to coordinate and ensure the coherence of actions carried out at the site. The Benin Government has allocated additional funding for the implementation of this plan.

Among the objectives set for the coming five years are:

- the establishment of partnerships at the local, national and international level,
- the increase of resources for the museum and the establishment of dynamic management and strengthening of capacities of the museum team, and the creation of a data base on the site,
- the creation of a management advisory body and establishment of a monitoring and evaluation system,
- the strengthening of legal protection,
- improved promotion, in line with the increased knowledge of the site and its components,
- the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, after an initial programme of action of five years.

The Committee congratulated the Benin authorities for their efforts in preparing the conservation plan, and the allocation of additional resources for this site. The Committee requested the Benin authorities to report to the Committee at its twenty-fourth session concerning the progress made in the implementation of this plan.

The Committee decided to retain the Royal Palaces of Abomey on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.16 Angkor (Cambodia)**

The Director of UNESCO's Division of Cultural Heritage, reported on progress made in the safeguarding of the site of Angkor which was inscribed on the World Heritage List and simultaneously on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1992.

He recalled that international assistance for Angkor is co-ordinated by an International Co-ordinating Committee co-chaired by the Ambassadors of Japan and France in Phnom Penh, with a Secretariat provided by UNESCO. The International Co-ordinating Committee for Angkor meets periodically to set priorities and monitor the conservation work on the site as well as to mobilize the necessary funds. He commented that through the international efforts to safeguard Angkor, the site is now the largest conservation workshop in the world.

Among the 1998 priorities decided upon by the International Co-ordinating Committee and supported by the Cambodian Minister of State and the Minister for Culture, were hydrological studies of the moats of Angkor financed under Emergency Assistance approved by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 1998. The Director reported that the operational projects being financed by UNESCO funds-in-trust and managed by the different international teams progress normally. Phase II of the restoration project for the Pre Rup Temple, financed by the Government of Italy through its UNESCO funds-in-trust, will commence in November 1998. A digital imagery department is also being set up at the photographic laboratory at the Angkor Conservation Office, with international assistance through UNESCO.

In additional, he reported that a bilaterally-financed project to restore the Preah Ko Temple will recommence in November 1998.

Commenting on the Secretariat's report, the Delegate of Japan announced that the "First Phase of Safeguarding Angkor" activities will be concluded in the spring of 1999 and financed by the Japanese Government with a US\$ 10 million contribution to UNESCO funds-in-trust. A "Second Phase" will commence in

June 1999 with an additional commitment of Japan to contribute a further US\$ 10 million over the course of the next six years, also through UNESCO funds-in-trust. The Delegate of Japan requested closer co-ordination between the Centre and the Cultural Heritage Division, in the implementation of international assistance activities at Angkor.

The Rapporteur, speaking in his capacity as the Delegate of Hungary, requested that the documentation of activities undertaken with international assistance which is routinely prepared for the Angkor International Co-ordinating Committee be made available to the Committee. He commented that documentation of this type – especially topographic data – is also important for periodic reporting.

The Delegate of France commented that the assistance to Angkor is internationally-co-ordinated assistance, contributed to by many donor countries, including France, and that this important fact should not be overlooked by the Committee.

The Delegate of the Republic of Korea commented that in spite of the considerable resources which are being committed by the international community to Angkor, this will not have the desired effect in safeguarding the site unless the Government of Cambodia and the international community increase their diligence in preventing the theft and traffic in cultural property from Angkor. He also inquired as to the guarantees of transparency and effective use of the considerable funds contributed to Angkor.

Italy supported the need for vigilance in preventing illicit traffic in cultural property, recalling the provisions of the UNIDROIT Convention in this respect.

Thailand explained the successful measures that have been taken to cut down on illicit cross-border trafficking in cultural property from Cambodia to Thailand.

The Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage explained UNESCO's support for action to combat illicit traffic in cultural property from Cambodia. He also clarified that funds-in-trust with UNESCO are subject to both internal and external audits.

The Rapporteur, speaking in his capacity as the Delegate of Hungary, also commented that the UNIDROIT Convention was starting to work in the market states as well as in the source states, pointing specifically to the return of suspected stolen works of art by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

The Committee noted the report of the Secretariat concerning Angkor and commended the continued efforts of the International Co-ordinating Committee in mobilizing international support for Angkor. The Committee expressed appreciation for the progress made in the implementation of the various restoration and training projects. The Committee requested the State Party and the Secretariat to continue its work in promoting measures to prevent the illicit traffic of cultural properties and to keep the Committee informed on developments in this regard.

The Committee decided to retain Angkor on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.17 Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)**

On the basis of a substantive report on the state of conservation of Dubrovnik that was submitted by the Croatian authorities, ICOMOS advised that it was greatly impressed by the restoration works undertaken in Dubrovnik, and strongly supported the request made by Croatia to delete Dubrovnik from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee, following the recommendation of the Bureau, decided with great satisfaction to delete the Old City of Dubrovnik from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It congratulated the Croatian authorities for the effective measures taken for the preservation and restoration of this World Heritage site.

It encouraged the authorities to continue and complete the excellent works of restoration and rehabilitation and to give due consideration to risk preparedness in the future planning and management of the city.

#### **VII.18 Bahla Fort (Oman)**

Following previous expert missions, a third mission took place in September 1998 to assess the quality of the restoration works in terms of authenticity and use of materials, advise on future works and particularly on the preparation of a management plan for an extended area, including the Fort and the oasis, as well as on the hydro-graphic survey that should be urgently undertaken.

The mission reported that photogrammetric works were due to begin, facilitating therefore the restoration of the Fort. It recommended, among other things, that the conservation plan be completed including planning of archaeological works. Finally, considering that the situation in the site has improved in a sensible manner, the mission discussed with the authorities the possibility of reinforcing the cost-sharing approach used so far. It submitted to the authorities a draft proposal and the Centre was awaiting a reply on this proposal.

The Committee commended the Government of Oman for the actions taken for the preservation of the Fort. It requested the Secretariat to collaborate with the national authorities in the preparation of a five-year conservation plan for the entire oasis, for examination by the Committee at its twenty-third session.

The Committee decided to retain the Bahla Fort on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.19 Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)**

The Government of Peru submitted in the course of 1998 periodic progress reports on the preparation of the management plan by an interdisciplinary team of experts.

As to the impact of the El Nino phenomenon, the Secretariat informed that this has been relatively modest and that the protective measures, undertaken with emergency assistance from the World Heritage Fund, were effective.

As to training, a second Pan-American Course on the Conservation and Management of Earthen Architectural and Archaeological Heritage will be held in Chan Chan in 1999 jointly organized by the Government of Peru, ICCROM, CRATERE EAG and the Getty Conservation Institute. This course will directly benefit to the preservation and management planning for the site.

The Committee commended the Government of Peru for its initiative to prepare a management plan for the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone. It requested the Government to submit the management plan as soon as it is finalized together with a report on the arrangements for its implementation.

The Committee decided to retain the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### **VII.20 Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)**

The Secretariat informed the Committee that it had received from the Polish authorities a technical report assessing the effectiveness of the dehumidifying system at the mines. The report stated that the system had contributed to the elimination of one of the major preservation hazards to historic sculptures, chambers and passages in the salt mine.

ICOMOS advised that the report was credible and that it fully supported the deletion of the Salt Mines from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee noted with satisfaction that the dehumidifying system, installed with the support of the World Heritage Fund, the Polish-American Fund of Maria Skłodowska-Curie and the Polish Government, had proven to be effective and made it possible to eliminate one of the major threats to the site.

It decided, therefore, to delete the Wieliczka Salt Mines from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **B. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**VII.21** The Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session examined the state of conservation of eighty-one properties inscribed on the World Heritage List (thirty-two natural; eight mixed and forty-one cultural properties), as well as World Heritage sites in Central America. The Committee examined nineteen of them and noted the decisions of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau on the remaining properties as reflected in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/5 (Report of the Bureau) and WHC-98/CONF.203/8.Rev.

#### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

##### **a) Reports on the state of conservation of natural properties examined by the Committee**

#### **VII.22 Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia)**

Since the Committee decided to remove this site from the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-first session, the Centre has received a brief status report on the site's protection. A seven-member Administrative Council is responsible for the management of the site. The Park has statutes and rules of procedures, with regulating principles for residents, staff and visitors. Further positive results have been achieved with the efforts to limit traffic through the Park by the construction of a detour around the Park. The authorities had provided a map showing the extension of the Park's boundaries by about 100 km<sup>2</sup>. The map has been returned to the Croatian authorities requesting them, in accordance with the recommendation of the last session of the Committee, to nominate the extension of the 100 km<sup>2</sup> using standard nomination procedures set out in paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines.

The Committee commended the authorities for their continuing efforts to enhance the protection of Plitvice Lakes National Park and urged them to nominate, as soon as possible, the 100km<sup>2</sup> extension, using standard nomination procedures set out in paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines.

## VII.23 Galapagos Islands (Ecuador)

The Committee at its twenty-first session invited the Government of Ecuador to notify the Chairperson of the Committee of the final enactment and entering into force of the Galapagos Special Law. The Committee decided that if, by the opening date of the twenty-second ordinary session of the Bureau, the Government of Ecuador had not notified the Chairperson of the enactment and entry into force of the "Special Galapagos Law", the Galapagos Islands be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At its twenty-second ordinary session in June 1998, the Bureau was informed that the "Special Law on the Galapagos" was published, on 18 March 1998, by the Official Registry of Ecuador as Law No. 278, and that the Chairperson of the Committee had been officially notified of the enactment and the entry into force of the Law. Hence, the Bureau recommended that the Committee not consider Galapagos Islands for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau noted that the Law, if implemented, would greatly strengthen conservation in both the Galapagos Islands as well as in the marine waters surrounding them. The Law provides for the extension of the outer boundary of the marine reserve from 24 to 64 km offshore and for the establishment of a significant 130,000 km<sup>2</sup> Reserve for the conservation of marine biodiversity where only tourism and artisanal fisheries will be permitted. The Bureau was satisfied to note that the Law addresses most of the major issues relating to conservation and sustainable development of Galapagos, including:

- regulations for the control and eradication of introduced species and the establishment of a quarantine inspection system;
- appreciation of Galapagos by local people and their participation in its conservation through environmental education;
- building local skills and conservation institutions, including the strengthening of the Galapagos National Park Service (GNPS) and improving inter-agency co-ordination through the work of a revived INGALA (Instituto Nacional de Galapagos);
- immigration and residence control measures to stabilise the rate of growth of human population size; and
- a participatory planning process for marine resources conservation.

The Bureau commended the Government of Ecuador and all agencies, groups, local residents and experts for reaching a consensus on this new Law. The Bureau urged the Ecuadorian authorities to ensure the effective implementation of the Law and invited them to re-nominate the Marine Reserve, deferred by the Committee in 1994, to be a part of the World Heritage site as soon as the management plan for the Marine Reserve is finalized in 1999.

The Charles Darwin Research Station (CDRS) and the GNPS have jointly implemented a project, partly financed by the World Heritage Fund, to gather basic information needed for the establishment of an ecological monitoring system for Galapagos. The final report of the project has been submitted and includes an exhaustive list of introduced species belonging to a number of animal and plant taxa. The Bureau was informed that an Inter-American Development Bank Project is being developed for Galapagos and, if approved, could facilitate the effective implementation of the Special Galapagos Law, particularly with regard to the conservation of marine resources and for ensuring sustainable tourism development. The Bureau learned that the UNESCO Office in Quito has entered into agreement with the Ecuadorian Ministry for the Environment for providing legal

assistance on the implementation of the Galapagos Law and that the volcanic eruption of the Cerro Azul on Isabela Island did not have any major impacts on the wildlife of Galapagos.

The Committee commended the Ecuadorean Government for ensuring the passage of, and entry into force of the Special Galapagos Law and decided not to consider including the Galapagos Islands in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee urged the State Party to re-nominate, in 1999, the Marine Reserve as an extension of the World Heritage site. The Committee drew the attention of the State Party to the Bureau's recommendation, made at its twenty-first ordinary session in June 1997, that the State Party submit annual reports on the state of conservation of Galapagos until the end of the year 2002. The Committee invited the State Party to submit the first of the requested series of annual reports to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

## VII.24 Lake Baikal (Russian Federation)

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a number of laws for the national protection of the Lake existed and that the Duma had adopted the Federal Law on "The Protection of the Baikal Lake" which was, however, vetoed by the President. The Federal Law had been tabled for a third reading in the Duma, taking into account comments made by the President's intervention. In addition to the legal concerns, the authorities had not come to any conclusions regarding the re-profiling of the Pulp and Paper Mill at Baikalsk, one of the main polluters of the Lake. The Observer of the Russian Delegation attending the Bureau session in June 1998 pointed out that the situation at Lake Baikal is of major concern, due to its unresolved legal status, continuing and increasing pollution, lack of resources for management and monitoring, and logging and other negative factors. The Observer was of the view that the site is under serious threat and that the State Party would not oppose inclusion of the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau had expressed its serious concerns over the threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal, and urged the State Party to inform the Centre, before 15 September 1998, of the status of the Baikal Law and its adoption as well as a time table for its implementation. The Bureau drew the attention of the Russian authorities to paragraphs 82-89 of the Operational Guidelines ("Procedure for the Inclusion of Properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger") and invited them to prepare a programme of corrective measures for submission to its twenty-second extraordinary session.

The Bureau was informed that the State Committee for the Environment had indicated, on 17 November 1998, that the Law is currently being revised and that, according to the UNESCO Office, Moscow, the reason for the revision was the need to include financial measures to implement the Law. The revision has been done both by the Region of Irkutsk and the Buryat Republic and has been through the Duma. It is expected that the Law will be approved in the near future. Concerning the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill, the Minister for Economy proposed an international competition to transform the mill. The State Committee however, indicated that there is no solution yet and the closing of the mill would aggravate the social problems of the region. Monitoring of the site is underway, despite financial problems. IUCN informed the Bureau that it does not recommend the inclusion of Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

The Observer of the Russian Federation stated that the law is being processed and that monitoring of the state of conservation of the site is underway. He informed the Committee that a meeting of the Governmental Baikal Commission is scheduled

for late December 1998. He underlined that the Russian Federation tries to fulfil its obligations under the World Heritage Convention and to protect the site.

The Committee took note of the information provided by the State Committee for the Environment and IUCN. It expressed its serious concerns about the problems of the site as indicated in the report of the twenty-second session of the Bureau. The Committee re-iterated its requests made at the time of the inscription of the site, in particular the urgent need to re-profile the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill and the adoption of the Baikal Law. The Committee noted that IUCN does not recommend inclusion of the Lake Baikal in the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

#### **VII.25 Doñana National Park (Spain)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a giant holding pool of the Aznalcollar mine owned by the Canadian-Swedish Boliden-Apirsa Company burst resulting in an ecological disaster. Although the main toxic flow had been diverted away from the National Park, the adjoining areas have been badly damaged. The Bureau was informed that the spill could spread into the World Heritage area as pollutants dispersed more widely. The State Party had submitted a number of technical reports on the situation and on actions taken to mitigate the threats. The President of the Spanish MAB Committee had proposed the organization of an international conference to review actions taken and rehabilitation plans elaborated for the conservation of the site and provided an outline for a project entitled "Doñana 2005". The State Party had welcomed UNESCO involvement and suggested that financial support be considered for this purpose. The Bureau had expressed its serious concerns on the long-term restoration of the property and urged the State Party to undertake all possible measures to mitigate the threats. Furthermore, the Bureau had requested the State Party to collaborate with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention to prepare an international expert conference to develop a long-term vision, and to compile a detailed report in time for the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Bureau was informed that at the invitation of the Spanish Government, the Centre carried out a mission from 10 to 13 November 1998 reviewing the situation at the site and the area affected by the toxic spill. The Centre received a number of documents presented by the Spanish authorities on the actions undertaken since the last session of the Bureau, including the Doñana 2005 project. The project "Doñana 2005 - hydrological regeneration of the watersheds and river channels flowing towards Doñana National Park", has been prepared by the Ministry for the Environment. It mainly proposes: (a) to avoid the influx of contaminated water into the Doñana marshes; (b) to restore the flow of waters towards Doñana in the long term (drinking water; original hydrological dynamics); and (c) to maintain the hydrological system of the connection between Doñana and the Guadalquivir Estuary. The Bureau noted that the World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve are currently little affected, whereas the Natural Park around the site has been impacted by the toxic spill. The actions taken by the Spanish authorities have been substantial. The Bureau suggested that great caution should be taken in re-starting mining activities and requested that EIAs be carried out for each step.

The Observer of Spain reiterated the threats to ecological integrity of the region and expressed his appreciation for the mission carried out prior to the Committee session to review the situation. He noted that, while the World Heritage site and UNESCO Biosphere Reserve were little affected by the spill, the impacts for the surrounding Natural Park and also for the agriculture and fisheries were considerable. He underlined the need to purify the polluted waters upstream of the site and the

estuary using biological filters and silt lagoons and the restoration of the marsh dynamics and ecological mechanisms. He provided copies of the "Doñana 2005" project to the Chairperson, IUCN and the Centre, which would need a budget of approximately US\$ 120,000,000.

IUCN underlined the lesson learnt from the Doñana spill that had also been learnt from other cases such as Everglades, Srebarna and Ichkeul; i.e. that many World Heritage natural sites are at the mercy of activities occurring upstream in the drainage basin of the site.

The Committee reiterated the Bureau's request that the State Party collaborates with UNESCO, IUCN and the Ramsar Convention to organize an international expert conference and to present its results to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Committee also invited the State Party to submit, in time for the next Bureau session, details concerning the financing plan and a time table for the implementation of the project "Doñana 2005" to be carried out in the framework of the Man and the Biosphere Reserve Programme (MAB). The Committee commended the State Party for the actions taken to prevent impacts to the World Heritage site by the toxic spill. It requested the State Party to proceed with great caution with regard to re-opening the mine and to monitor long-term impacts for both the World Heritage site and the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.

#### **VII.26 Canaima National Park (Venezuela)**

The Committee at its twenty-first session expressed its concern with regard to the integrity of the Canaima National Park due to considerable threats posed by a proposal to erect a series of power transmission lines across the Park. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that the Director-General of UNESCO had transmitted the Committee's concerns and recommendations to the President of Venezuela. In his response, the President of Venezuela had re-affirmed the commitment of his Government to protect the World Heritage site and welcomed the possibility of a UNESCO mission to the site to evaluate the project and determine the boundaries of the World Heritage site. An IUCN-Centre mission to Venezuela, including a site visit to Canaima, planned for late August 1998, had to be postponed upon instructions from the Resident Representative of UNDP in Venezuela. In the meantime, IUCN has received several reports from indigenous people living in the Gran Sabana and the Imataca areas expressing their strong concerns over the future of the Canaima National Park. Although the Committee's deliberations have revolved around the construction of the power line, IUCN has pointed out that serious attention should be given to plans to open up the fragile ecosystem of this Park and the Imataca rainforest to large-scale mining, tourism and logging concessions.

On 28 September 1998, the Permanent Delegation of Venezuela to UNESCO invited the Centre and IUCN to field a site visit as soon as possible. The Bureau was informed that the UN Resident Representative in Caracas, Venezuela, is unable to provide clearance for the mission until 9 December 1998. A mission is foreseen for early 1999. IUCN has suggested that the Committee's recommendation, made at the time of inscription of the site (December 1994), that the Government of Venezuela co-operate with the Centre and IUCN to "initiate a process to review the boundaries of the site, taking into consideration the interests of the local people and the need to focus the nomination on the Tepui portion (approximately 2 million ha) of the Park", be used as a basis for establishing the terms of reference for the mission.

The Committee called upon the Centre and IUCN to field a mission to Canaima as soon as security clearance from the UN Resident Co-ordinator for Venezuela is available. The Committee agreed with IUCN that the terms of reference for the mission be

derived from the recommendations of the Committee made at the time of the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List in 1994. The Committee requested that the findings of the mission and its recommendation concerning whether Canaima needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger be submitted to the twenty-third session of the Bureau in 1999.

**a) Reports on the state of conservation of natural properties noted by the Committee**

**VII.27** The Committee noted the decisions of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau as reflected in the Report of the Bureau session (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/5) and included in Annex IV on the following properties:

**Great Barrier Reef (Australia)**

In addition to the report noted by the Committee (Annex IV), the Delegate of Australia informed the Committee that Australia hosted an International Symposium on Tropical Marine Ecosystem Management (ITMEMS), which called upon the global community for urgent action and co-ordinated efforts to address threats to coral reefs and tropical marine systems. The Committee noted and supported this initiative, and encouraged States Parties to identify suitable areas of coral reefs, mangroves and sea grasses for nomination to the World Heritage List and protection under other international treaties.

**Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia)**

**Shark Bay, Western Australia (Australia)**

**Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)**

**Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)**

**Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

**Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)**

**Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)**

**Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)**

**Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)**

**Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)**

**Los Katios National Park (Colombia)**

**Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica)**

**Nanda Devi National Park (India)**

**Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaíno (Mexico)**

**Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)**

**Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal)**

**Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)**

**Huascarán National Park (Peru)**

The Committee noted that the Bureau's decision reflected the suggestion to establish an informal contact group on mining and World Heritage and that the IUCN "Draft Policy on Mining and Protected Areas" will be circulated.

**Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russian Federation)**

The Observer of the Russian Federation informed the Committee that the Federal and Regional authorities agree with the development of the Aginskoe Gold Mine project in the Kamchatka Province. The new data and documents which were transmitted to the Centre, include the results of a Feasibility Study which noted that the proposed development of the mining project is outside the territory of the Bystrinsky Natural Park. The Committee noted IUCN's efforts to monitor the state of conservation of this area of the World Heritage site if the proposed Aginskoe Gold Mine Project proceeds.

**Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)**

The Observer of the Russian Federation confirmed that gold exploration has been halted and that the affected lands are being restored.

**Skocjan Caves (Slovenia)**

**Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries (Thailand)**

The Delegate of Thailand informed the Committee that the fire affected only a small part of the site and that such surface fires are a normal part of the dynamics of the dipterocarp forest ecosystem. His statement is included as Annex V of this report.

**St. Kilda (United Kingdom)**

The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that the following statement should be included in the text: The decision on the blocks offered for petroleum licensing was agreed with the Joint Nature Conservation Committee who co-ordinated their response with Scottish Nature.

**Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

The Observer of Vietnam informed the Committee that his Government noted the Bureau report and considered that the preservation and conservation of the World Heritage site should be parallel and in harmony with the socio-economic development of the area. With regard to Ha Long Bay, the Vietnam authorities have the initial results of the JICA (Japan) Environmental Management Study which show that there are no serious environmental impacts in the World Heritage area. The final results of the study will provide further clarification and a clearer picture.

**Durmitor National Park (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)**

The Committee noted the UN official name for the State Party: Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

**Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)**

The Delegate of Zimbabwe pointed out that the response of the Zimbabwean Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (ZDNPWLM) concerning the hotel development proposal has been reflected in the Annex IV to this report, and that the organization of a bi-national meeting with representatives from the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe should be in the framework of the existing co-operation.

**MIXED (NATURAL AND CULTURAL) HERITAGE**

**a) Reports on the state of conservation of mixed properties examined by the Committee**

**VII.28 Kakadu National Park (Australia)**

The twenty-first sessions of the World Heritage Committee and Bureau examined reports on the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park from the Australian authorities and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in 1997. Reports were also examined by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee in June 1998. The reports from IUCN noted potential threats from the proposal to commence construction of a uranium mine on the Jabiluka Mineral Lease within one of the three enclaves in the World Heritage property. The Commonwealth Government of Australia provided reports to demonstrate its commitment to the conservation of World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park. The reports detailed the assessment and approvals process that has allowed development of the Jabiluka uranium mine site to proceed. The reports also outlined the assessment process being conducted to determine the milling and tailing management options for the Jabiluka mine. The World Heritage Centre had received many protest letters concerning the Jabiluka mine from around the world.

The Chairperson recalled that the twenty-second session of the Bureau in June 1998, requested that an expert mission be fielded to Kakadu National Park, Australia and that the report of the



mission be presented to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and the twenty-second session of the Committee.

The Chairperson recalled that the mission report (WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.18) was presented to, and discussed by, the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau. Furthermore he noted that the Bureau had agreed upon a number of recommendations and that two of the advisory bodies, IUCN and ICOMOS, had made statements on the subject. He recalled that the mission had been led by the former Chairperson of the Committee, Professor Francioni (Italy). He thanked Professor Francioni for the leadership he had provided in examining the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park and thanked the other six members of the mission team – the Director of the World Heritage Centre, P. Dugan (IUCN), P. Parker (ICOMOS), J. Cook (US National Park Service) and J. Altman and R. Green from Australia. Furthermore, he thanked the Australian authorities for their considerable assistance and hospitality during the mission.

The Chairperson acknowledged the presence of Yvonne Margarula the senior traditional owner from the Mirrar Gundjehmi Aboriginal clan. The Mirrar are the traditional owners for the area covered by the Jabiluka and Ranger mining leases. Their traditional land extends into Kakadu National Park. He then invited Professor Francioni to present the main findings and recommendations of the mission and the recommendations of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau.

Professor Francioni began his presentation (Annex VI.1) by referring to the objective of the mission as being to determine and describe any ascertained and potential threats to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park, particularly in relation to possible threats arising from the Jabiluka uranium mining proposal. He referred to the presentation he had made at the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau at which time he had outlined the mandate, organization and membership of the mission, and the process of report preparation (WHC-98/CONF.203/5).

Professor Francioni informed the Committee that the mission report focuses primarily on ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park posed by the Jabiluka mining proposal, and presents 16 recommendations. He noted that the mission had concluded, in its first recommendation, that there are severe ascertained and potential dangers to the cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka. The mission therefore recommended that the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed.

Professor Francioni projected a map of Kakadu National Park that showed three mineral leases (Ranger, Jabiluka and Koongarra) located within enclaves of the Park. He showed a slide of the open cut uranium mine at Ranger which has been in operation for 18 years and is expected to continue operating for another seven or eight years. He then showed slides illustrating the status of the construction of the uranium mine at Jabiluka at the end of October 1998. He informed the Committee that the Jabiluka mine will be an underground mine that will however, require significant surface works and facilities. He showed the location of the mine portal that provides an entrance to the 1,800 metre mine decline currently under construction and the location of the retention pond.

Professor Francioni reported that the mission had been concerned that the construction of a mine, and mining of uranium, at Jabiluka have been presented to the Committee as a *fait accompli*. Furthermore he commented that the mission had noted the relevance of Paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines* as it

clearly states that States Parties should inform the Committee of their intention to undertake or to authorize major restorations or new constructions which may affect World Heritages values and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse.

Professor Francioni informed the Committee that the mission had seriously questioned the compatibility of mining, and particularly uranium mining and milling, with such close proximity, and upstream from, a World Heritage property. The mission regarded the Jabiluka mine as contributing threats that are posing both ascertained and potential dangers to the cultural and natural values of the World Heritage property. The mission determined that there are three issues of scientific uncertainty that lead to a finding of potential danger: (i) the degree of uncertainty concerning the quality of the hydrological modeling carried out in designing the water management plan for the mine site; (ii) the degree of uncertainty concerning the effectiveness of the concrete pasting process as a means of storing the tailings in the mine void, and (iii) the possible impacts on catchment ecosystems. The mission had therefore concluded that application of the Precautionary Principle required that mining operations at Jabiluka not proceed.

Professor Francioni referred to the visual impacts and dangers to the cultural values and living cultural heritage of Kakadu National Park. He referred to the mission's findings concerning the lack of recognition of the Kakadu cultural landscape and the need to reassess and expand the boundaries of the Park. He briefly outlined the threats to the continuation of the "joint management" regime at Kakadu National Park, referred to an overall breakdown in trust and communication between some stakeholders, and informed the Committee of the mission's recommendation concerning the Koongarra Mineral Lease, the town of Jabiru and invasive plant and animal species.

In conclusion, Professor Francioni referred briefly to the recommendations of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and again emphasised that in spite of the dangers to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park, construction of the mine at Jabiluka began earlier this year and is currently progressing.

The Chairperson thanked Professor Francioni for his detailed and exhaustive presentation.

The Delegate of Thailand observed that the issue confronting the Committee was charged with emotion. He noted that the enclaves of Ranger, Jabiluka and Koongarra are excised from the World Heritage property and were therefore not included in the three stages of the nomination of Kakadu National Park in 1981, 1987 and 1992. He stated that he could not accept the Delegate of Australia's view that a World Heritage property can only be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger with the consent of the State Party concerned. He maintained that the World Heritage Committee has the authority under the Convention (Article 11(4)) to place any World Heritage property threatened by serious and specific dangers on the List of World Heritage in Danger at any time in case of urgent need. He noted that Dubrovnik had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger without consultation with the State Party. He commented that the consent of a State Party is only required in the case of a property being included on the World Heritage List.

The Delegate of Thailand referred to the sovereign rights of the State Party and to the authority of the Committee to enter a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He asked the Delegate of Australia for confirmation concerning the proposed system of disposing of the tailings from future mining of uranium at Jabiluka. He questioned whether the system had been designed so as to ensure that there would not be the possibility of spillage, leakage or underground seepage of any contaminants at any time and under any circumstances whatsoever from the disposal site.

The Delegate of the United States of America referred to the recommendations of the twenty-second session of the Bureau being examined by the Committee, as a consensus text that tries to establish an equilibrium recognizing the rights of States Parties, the interests of the Convention and the concerns of Bureau members. She reminded the Committee that the language of the recommendations was developed over long hours of consultation between the parties concerned. She therefore moved that the recommendations be immediately adopted. The Delegate of Japan endorsed the proposal.

Following an extensive debate concerning the procedural mechanism to be used to implement the recommendations of the twenty-second session of the Bureau, the Committee adopted the following decision:

The Committee recognised the report of the mission to Kakadu National Park as being both thorough and credible. The Committee:

- (i) expressed grave concern at the ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park which, as noted in the mission report, are posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka;
- (ii) noted with concern that in spite of the dangers to the World Heritage values, construction of the mine at Jabiluka began in June 1998 and is currently progressing;
- (iii) has been informed by the Australian authorities that construction of the mine decline and site will proceed; however in the next six months no mining of uranium will take place, the construction of the mill will not commence and an export permit for the Jabiluka uranium will not be issued. The Committee has also been informed that the Australian authorities will act to complete the cultural heritage management plan with independent public review and they will accelerate the implementation of the Kakadu Region Social Impact Study;
- (iv) noted that there is significant difference of opinion concerning the degree of certainty of the science used to assess the impact of the mine on the World Heritage values of Kakadu (notably hydrological modeling, prediction and impact of severe weather events, storage of uranium ore on the surface and the long-term storage of the mine tailings);
- (v) noted that the associative cultural values, and the archaeological and rock art sites, on the basis of which Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List, and the ability of affected Aboriginal communities to continue their traditional relationships to the land, are threatened by the Jabiluka mine proposal; and,
- (vi) emphasized the fundamental importance of ensuring thorough and continuing participation, negotiation and communication with Aboriginal traditional owners, custodians and managers in the conservation of the outstanding heritage values of Kakadu for future generations.

In view of the ascertained and potential dangers posed by the Jabiluka uranium mine that are noted in the report of the World Heritage mission to Kakadu, and have again been noted with concern by the Committee, IUCN, ICCROM and ICOMOS, the Committee decided the following:

1. In light of the concerns expressed by the Delegate of Australia, the Australian authorities be requested to provide, by **15 April 1999**, a detailed report on their efforts to prevent further damage and to mitigate all the threats identified in the World Heritage mission report, to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park, Australia. The report should address these threats posed by the construction of the Jabiluka mine, by the mining of uranium ore at Jabiluka, and the alternatives for milling the ore at Jabiluka and Ranger. The report should be prepared in accordance with the intent of (vi) above. The report submitted by the Australian authorities should include a detailed update on the implementation of the cultural heritage management plan referred to in (iii) above and in the mission report.
2. Immediately upon its receipt by the Secretariat, the report referred to in paragraph 1 above, be provided to ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN, who will ensure that the twenty-third session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, be provided with a written independent expert review concerning the mitigation of threats posing ascertained and potential dangers to Kakadu National Park by the Jabiluka mine. The expert opinion of ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN will be provided to the Secretariat by **15 May 1999** for immediate distribution to members of the Bureau and the Australian authorities.
3. The Australian authorities be requested to direct the Australian Supervising Scientist Group to conduct a full review of the scientific issues referred to in Paragraph (iv) above, to be provided to the Secretariat by **15 April 1999**. The review will be submitted to peer review by an independent scientific panel composed of scientists selected by UNESCO in consultation with the International Council of Scientific Unions and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The report of the peer review will be provided to the Secretariat by **15 May 1999** for immediate distribution to members of the Bureau, IUCN and the Australian authorities.
4. The reports referred to in Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 will be examined by the twenty-third session of the Bureau.
5. The twenty-second session of the Committee has decided that an extraordinary session of the Committee, to immediately follow the twenty third session of the Bureau in July 1999, will be convened at UNESCO Headquarters to decide whether to immediately inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Representative of ICOMOS said that despite the concern expressed by the Bureau at its twenty-second session in June 1998, the construction of the mine at Jabiluka was continuing. He referred to Kakadu National Park as being in danger because

the work on the mine had continued. He questioned the legality of the proposed delegation of responsibility by the Committee to the Bureau as had been expressed in the recommendations from the twenty-second session of the Bureau. He cautioned the Committee that if it was to continue the situation could become irreversible.

The Representative of IUCN read a joint statement by IUCN and ICOMOS in which they stated that the conditions exist for inscribing Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Annex VI.2). The statement also cautioned that a failure to recognise the dangers to the property would diminish the standards of, and risk prejudicing the prestige of the Convention.

The Representative of ICCROM informed the Committee that they had not been invited by the World Heritage Centre to be involved in the issue. He stated that it was important to follow the principles of the Convention. He referred in particular to ICCROM's hope that the Committee would give proper weight to the opinion of the advisory bodies in its considerations. He insisted that if scientific research provided by the advisory bodies indicates, without any doubt, that the values of Kakadu National Park are threatened, the decision is expected to be consistent with the principles previously applied and it should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In conclusion, he informed the Committee that ICCROM was available to assist the Committee in mediating between the different viewpoints on this issue.

The Delegate of Australia said that his Government had not stood in the path of the Committee in its consensus decision to adopt the recommendations of the Bureau. He said that while his Government could not associate itself with some of the Bureau's conclusions and judgments, it would undertake to provide the reports and reviews requested by the Committee. The Delegate of Australia then responded to a number of the concerns expressed by Committee members as to the urgency of the issue (see Annex VI.3).

The Delegate of France referred to the mission report as being impressive, complete, and highly accurate with a clear commentary having been presented by the former Chairperson. He referred to the decision of the Committee as leaving little time for Australia to provide its point of view and commented that this was right and correct. He did say however that he was not entirely satisfied. Indeed, he noted that the time that had been granted would enable a response from the Australian authorities however, the mining company will proceed with its work. He said that he found this a little shocking as it could be interpreted as jeopardizing the Committee and its authority. He warned that the mining company might think that the Committee has given their tacit approval of the mining activity.

The Delegate of France expressed his concern that the Committee may be interpreted as not taking a stand against the *fait accompli* presented to it. He stated that he would not like the decision of the Committee to be contested in a divisive way in the future. He recommended that the Committee call on Australia's good will and desire to co-operate and voluntarily suspend the construction of the mine until the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

The Delegate of Cuba expressed her concern as to the seriousness of the threats to Kakadu National Park, not just to the physical heritage, but to the human heritage. She expressed her agreement with the advisory bodies that the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegate of Zimbabwe agreed with the proposal from France and acknowledged that this was a test case and a threshold issue. He noted the high powered delegations that visited Australia to assess the Kakadu case. It comprised the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Francioni, the Director of the World

Heritage Centre and other eminent persons. He declared that a procedural precedent had been set that could well be relevant to the examination of state of conservation of other World Heritage properties. He referred to the need to ensure the participation of traditional owners in the action plan and timetable in paragraphs 1 to 3, as well as in paragraphs (v) and (vi) of the preamble section of the Committee decision. This point was later supported by Benin and Hungary.

The Delegate of Hungary recommended that a dialogue with both actual or potential developers and the traditional owners be maintained and, appropriate conclusions be drawn based on such experiences by the Committee at a later stage.

The Delegate of the United States of America stated that the proposal to cease construction of the mine flowed logically from the recommendations of the Bureau adopted by the Committee. She stated that the position of the Australian Government was understood and respected. However, she commented that the mission report raised many serious and legitimate concerns that cannot be overlooked. The Delegate of the United States of America concluded by stating that the Committee should go on record as requesting the parties concerned to voluntarily halt construction of the mine decline pending the review by the Bureau at its twenty-third session in 1999.

Following statements by the Delegates of Benin, Canada, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Morocco, Niger and Thailand a clear consensus emerged and the Committee adopted an additional decision:

The Committee urged the Australian authorities and Energy Resources Australia Inc. to immediately undertake, in the context of their examination of the mission report, the voluntary suspension of construction of the mine decline until the twenty-third session of the Bureau in July 1999.

The Delegate of Australia disassociated his government from the decision (see Annex VI.4).

## **VII.29 Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru)**

The Committee recalled that over the last three years the Committee and the Bureau examined the state of conservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu at several occasions, particularly with reference to adequate management arrangements and comprehensive master planning. It also recalled that the Committee and the Bureau had reiterated that no actions should be undertaken on the implementation of a cable car system, or to that effect any other major works, until an adequate master plan is in place.

In response to the concerns expressed by the Committee and the Bureau, the Government of Peru prepared, as a joint effort between several institutions, a Master Plan for the Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. This was adopted by the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA) and the National Institute for Culture (INC) at the end of October 1998 and received at the World Heritage Centre on 17 November 1998.

The Committee commended the Government of Peru for the actions it had taken to respond to the concerns expressed by the Committee and its Bureau, particularly the adoption of the Master Plan for the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. It requested IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake an in-depth examination of the Master Plan and to submit its findings to the twenty-third session of the Bureau in June/July 1999.

It requested the Peruvian authorities to transmit all relevant documentation and provisions with regard to the management

structure and Master Plan for the Sanctuary, the cable car system (Environmental Impact Study, detailed plans etc.), as well as other works or projects that are or will be considered for implementation within the boundaries of the World Heritage site as soon as they become available, to the World Heritage Centre. This information will be reviewed by ICOMOS and IUCN and examined by the Bureau and/or the Committee.

The Committee furthermore requested the Bureau to consider at its twenty-third session whether it is appropriate for IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake a second mission to Peru to assess the implementation and effectiveness of the Master Plan, the project of the cable car system, the eventual hotel extension and other major works that may be planned. The Committee urged the Government of Peru not to take any decision on projects that could have considerable impact on the World Heritage values of the Park prior to a possible IUCN/ICOMOS mission. Prior consultations with the World Heritage Committee as recommended in paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines should also be envisaged.

Finally, the Committee commended the Finnish Government for its interest in the preservation of the Park and the implementation of a major debt-swap project to this effect.

**b) Reports on the state of conservation of mixed properties noted by the Committee**

**VII.30** The Committee noted the decisions of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau as reflected in the Report of the Bureau session (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/5) and included in Annex IV on the following properties:

**Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**  
**Mount Taishan (China, Peoples Republic of)**  
**Mount Huangshan (China, People's Republic of)**  
**Ohrid Region with its Cultural and Historical Aspect and its Natural Environment (Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of)**  
**Cliff of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) (Mali)**  
**Tongariro National Park (New Zealand).**

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**a) Reports on the state of conservation of cultural properties examined by the Committee**

**VII.31 Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic)**

At the request of the authorities of the Dominican Republic, an expert mission was undertaken in August 1998 to assess the state of conservation of the World Heritage site of Santo Domingo. The report emphasized the need to balance interventions in the physical-environmental recuperation of the area, tourism development and the socio-cultural development of the local population (housing, services etc.). It furthermore stressed that the effective control by the Office for the Cultural Heritage depends very much on the adoption of the Master Plan for the City which would establish an extended protection zone and norms for land-use. It also pointed out that several buildings in the city had collapsed recently, not caused by natural disasters but by the lack of maintenance.

On 22 September 1998, Hurricane Georges caused severe damage to the Dominican Republic. The Secretariat received reports from the Office for Cultural Heritage of the Dominican Republic and the national ICOMOS Committee. It was reported that serious damage was caused to residential buildings, churches and to the Casa de Juan de Herrera at the Plaza de Colon.

The Committee expressed concern about the damage caused by Hurricane George to the World Heritage site of Santo Domingo and encouraged the national authorities to take the necessary measures for the consolidation and safeguarding of the damaged buildings. It expressed its readiness to assist in undertaking emergency measures for the consolidation and recuperation of damaged buildings. It noted that the Chairperson had approved emergency assistance for the safeguarding of the Casa de Juan de Herrera.

At the same time, however, the Committee noted that part of the damage could only occur due to the lack of maintenance and preventive measures. It stressed the need for risk preparedness and preventive planning and conservation measures, particularly in hurricane prone areas such as the Caribbean.

The Committee requested the authorities to submit, by 15 April 1999, a progress report on the actions taken in response to the report of the monitoring mission of August 1998 and to the damage caused by Hurricane Georges.

The Committee requested the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to look into the possibilities to develop specific activities for the Caribbean to promote and implement risk preparedness schemes.

**VII.32 Aksum (Ethiopia)**

In November 1998, a staff member of ICCROM during a pre-appraisal mission for The World Bank in Ethiopia, noted that a wooded site directly across from the main Stele had been cleared of its trees, and that the Ethiopian Orthodox Church had plans to build a residence for the Patriarch of the Church. However, no construction work had yet commenced. It furthermore noted that the Director of the Centre for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (CRCCH), while aware of the planned construction, had not been shown the plans of the proposed building nor was he informed that work was about to begin.

The Committee, aware of the very important role of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church in the life of the community, and as a hold of very important cultural heritage in the town of Aksum and Ethiopia, requested

1. the Centre to send a letter to the Centre for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (CRCCH) and the Patriarch of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church drawing attention to the significance of the World Heritage values of the site and underlining the need to preserve it, which would require the postponement of any further work in the proximity of the Stele,
2. that the mission on the state of conservation planned by the World Heritage Centre in June 1998, which was postponed for security reasons, be carried out as soon as possible with the purpose of drawing a clear definition of the boundaries of the World Heritage site,
3. due support and consideration be given by the Ethiopian institutions and UNESCO to the preparation of a comprehensive town plan of Aksum with a clear conservation component which balances the conservation constraints with the need for the continued growth and development of the city and the communities of Aksum.

### **VII.33 Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Former Abbey of Saint-Remi and Palace of Tau, Reims (France)**

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its twenty-second session requested the French authorities a report on the planning for the surrounding of the Cathedral and on the project for the construction of a media library (mediateque) in its vicinity. The Secretariat informed that it had received information from a non-governmental organization that the demolition permit for the existing buildings on the location of the media library had been delivered and authorization for the building of the media library would have been given.

ICOMOS reported that it had sent an expert mission to Reims and that it was of the opinion that the scale of the building of the media library is too large, that its height and form will not provide a balanced townscape, that the monumental scale of the building is wholly out of context with the building's immediate surroundings and can, therefore, not be properly integrated in it. ICOMOS also expressed the opinion that a clearly defined buffer zone around the monuments inscribed on the World Heritage List should be established and that a management plan for the monuments and their buffer zone should be prepared.

As to the planning for the surroundings of the Cathedral (the 'Parvis'), the French Delegate confirmed information provided by the French authorities that a commission had been established to study the preservation and planning of the 'Parvis' and that it invited ICOMOS to participate in this commission. He stressed that the setting of the Cathedral had been completely destroyed during the First World War and that, since then, no coherence had been given to its urban space and to the surrounding architecture. He informed that a protection zone would be identified, as stipulated by French legislation, to replace the five hundred-meter radius around national monuments. He said that the media library was necessary to revitalise the area and that the building project had been revised and approved.

The Committee noted the information provided by ICOMOS and the French Delegate. It encouraged both parties to continue the dialogue on the planning for the surroundings of the Cathedral and to keep the Committee informed on progress made in this respect.

### **VII.34 Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin (Germany)**

The Minister of Science, Research and Culture of the Land of Brandenburg submitted the fourth state of conservation report as per the request of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session. This report was made available to the Committee as Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.15.

The report referred to the proposed extension of the World Heritage site, the Planning Guidelines, town planning competitions for the Green Centre – Alter Markt/Lustgarten and the Quartier am Bahnhof, as well as other specific building projects.

The Committee took note of the report. It commended the authorities of the Land of Brandenburg for the actions taken in response to the recommendations made by the Committee at its twenty-first session.

The Committee welcomed the submission of the proposed extension to the World Heritage site and requested the Bureau to examine this proposal at its twenty-third session in the light of the discussions and recommendations made by the Committee at its twentieth and twenty-first sessions.

The Committee noted the completion of the urban competition for the Green Centre –Alter Markt/ Lustgarten. As to the town planning competition for the Quartier am Bahnhof, the Committee regretted that the reconsideration of the building blocks 9 to 12 in the context of the results of the competition had not led to a major revision of the programme or design of these blocks and had therefore not resulted in an entirely satisfactory solution. It noted, however, with satisfaction the information provided by the Observer of Germany that the height of the building had been reduced and no longer would interfere with the visual lines of the components of the World Heritage site. It considered that their volume and monotony constitute a negative element in the urban context. A revision of their design could still diminish their negative impact.

The Committee encouraged the municipal authorities to continue the process of urban planning and the development of planning guidelines to this effect. It appreciated the commitment of the authorities to transmit the planning guidelines for the Potsdam cultural landscape to the World Heritage Committee by the end of 1998. It requested ICOMOS to examine these guidelines in the context of the evaluation mission it will undertake to Potsdam in early 1999 and to submit its findings to the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

With reference to the 'German Unity Transport Project No 17' (improvement of waterways), examined by the Committee at its twentieth session, the Committee commended the Federal Government for the efforts to find an alternative solution that would avoid any interference in the Babelsberg Park or other components of the Potsdam cultural landscape.

In conclusion, the Committee requested the State Party to submit by 15 September 1999 for examination by the Committee at its twenty-third session, a fifth state of conservation report particularly on the following matters:

- Final version of the planning guidelines and information on their adoption and enforcement;
- Progress in the implementation of the winning project for the Quartier am Bahnhof as well as on measures taken to diminish the negative impact of building blocks 9-12 on the architectural and urban environment;

- Results of the consideration of alternative routes for the waterways under 'German Unity Transport Project No 17' and their possible impact on the integrity for the World Heritage site.

#### **VII.35 Forts and Castles of Ghana (Ghana)**

The Forts and Castles of Ghana, as inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979, consist of three castles, 15 forts in a relatively good condition, ten forts in ruins and seven sites with traces of former fortifications. All sites are protected monuments in the custody of the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB), with the exception of James Fort, Accra and Fort William, Anomabu, which are still being used as prisons. The sites are periodically inspected, however, their regular maintenance and conservation is severely affected by the limited financial resources of the GMMB.

During the period 1992–1997 major conservation works were carried out on Cape Coast Castle in Cape Coast, St. George's Castle and Fort St. Jago in Elmina within the scope of the Historic Preservation component of the "Central Region Integrated Development Programme" funded by UNDP and USAID.

The main threats to the sites can be confined to three principal areas: environmental pressures; lack of buffer zones and development pressure and lack of adequate funding for the regular maintenance and conservation of the sites.

The Committee:

- thanked the national authorities in Ghana for their efforts in preservation of the World Heritage sites in Ghana and congratulated them on the recent conservation works carried out in Cape Coast and Elmina;
- urged the national authorities to ensure that all the Forts listed as World Heritage are not used for unrelated purposes such as prisons and that their World Heritage values are preserved;
- recommended priority be given to sustainable conservation and not to the rehabilitation of buildings for tourism purposes;
- recommended that action be taken urgently to define buffer zones around the properties, as well as other protective measures to stop further environmental degradation of the areas in the direct vicinity of the World Heritage sites;
- recommended that the national authorities in Ghana submit an Emergency Assistance request with regard to the urgent conservation works on some of the Forts;
- encouraged the authorities to implement awareness building activities among the population.

#### **VII.36 Island of Mozambique (Mozambique)**

Thanks to a contribution from the World Heritage Fund, the World Heritage site Ilha de Mozambique, has been the object of the World Heritage Centre's "Programme for Sustainable Human Development and Integral Conservation". The programme, prepared in 1996, is funded by: UNDP – US\$ 300,000 (over the period 1997-1999), UNESCO – US\$ 100,000, European Union – US\$ 100,000 and the Finnish Government, which is financing a post of an Associate Expert for the 2-year period (1997-1998). Currently, a number of micro-projects in such areas as: water and sanitation, tourism development and heritage restoration, are being developed. These projects will be presented to potential donors during the donor meeting scheduled for February 1999.

In addition, works have already started on the restoration of the Casa da Cultura building to be used as the project office. The

restoration is progressing relatively quickly and completion expected by January 1999.

The Committee congratulated the Mozambique authorities for their efforts to preserve the Ilha de Mozambique by taking into account the social and economic aspects of the site and called upon the potential donors to support this endeavour.

The Committee requested the authorities to report at its twenty-third session on the results of the donor's meeting and on the progress made in the implementation of the "Programme for Sustainable Human Development and Integral Conservation".

#### **VII.37 Kathmandu Valley (Nepal)**

The Committee, at its seventeenth session, expressed deep concern over the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley site and considered the possibility of placing this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, following discussions on the findings of the 1993 Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS Review Mission.

At its twenty-first session, the Committee examined the state of conservation report of this site, and in view of the continued deterioration of the World Heritage values in the Bauddhanath and Kathmandu Monument Zones, affecting the integrity and inherent characteristics of the site, the Committee requested the Secretariat, in collaboration with ICOMOS and His Majesty's Government (HMG) of Nepal, to study the possibility of deleting selected areas within some Monument Zones, without jeopardizing the universal significance and value of the site as a whole. This review was to take into consideration the intention of HMG of Nepal to nominate Kokhana as an additional Monument Zone.

The Committee authorized up to US\$ 35,000 from the World Heritage Fund Technical Co-operation budget for a Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal team to conduct a thorough study and to elaborate a programme for corrective measures in accordance with paragraphs 82-89 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Based upon the information of this study and recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee, at its twenty-first session, decided that it could consider whether or not to inscribe this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its twenty-second session. Following this decision, a Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission was organized in March-April 1998.

The Committee examined the findings and results of the Joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-HMG of Nepal Mission, and the 55 recommendations and Time-Bound Action Plan adopted by HMG of Nepal. The Committee commended HMG of Nepal for its efforts in strengthening the management of the Kathmandu Valley site with the creation of the *Heritage Conservation Unit*. The Committee took note of the special efforts made by the local authorities to raise awareness amongst the private home owners to prevent further illegal demolition and inappropriate new constructions, which destroys the essential historical urban fabric of the Kathmandu Valley site.

The Committee decided to defer consideration of the inscription of the Kathmandu Valley site on the List of World Heritage in Danger until its twenty-third session. However, the Committee requested HMG of Nepal to continue implementing the 55 recommendations of the Joint Mission and to respect the deadlines of the Time-Bound Action Plan adopted by HMG of Nepal. In addition, the Committee recommended that HMG of Nepal adopt the three additional ICOMOS recommendations annexed to the 55 recommendations adopted by HMG of Nepal. Moreover, the Committee requested HMG of Nepal to submit a report on the progress made in implementing the 55 recommendations before 15 April 1999 for examination by the twenty-third session of the Bureau in June 1999.



Finally, the Committee requested HMG of Nepal to take measures to ensure that adequate protection and management are put into place at Kokhana, prior to its nomination as an additional Monument Zone to the Kathmandu Valley site.

#### **VII.38 Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland)**

The Committee recalled that on 5 March 1997 a 'Declaration Concerning Principles for Implementation of Program Oswiecimski' was initialed by the Polish Government Plenipotentiary for the Government Strategic Plan for Oswiecim, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, the International Council of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau and the Mayor of Oswiecim in the presence of the President of Poland. The Committee took note of information provided by the Secretariat on the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration, particularly through an expert meeting that was held on 2 and 3 June 1998 on the spatial management of the area around the two Concentration Camps. It took note, furthermore, of the information provided by the Observer of Poland that further consultations are taking place with the participants of the expert meeting and that the Government of Poland will present a progress report. It requested the Polish authorities submit this report by 15 April 1999 for examination by the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

The Committee confirmed its support for the principles laid out in the Declaration of March 1997 and also confirmed its support that this process continues in a consensual manner among all parties involved. It expressed the belief that no steps should be made unless consensus is reached.

The Committee expressed its readiness to contribute to the implementation of this process, if required.

#### **VII.39 Central Zone of Angra do Heroismo in the Azores (Portugal)**

The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-second ordinary session, was informed about a marina project that seriously threatened the characteristic features of the waterfront of the World Heritage site. ICOMOS undertook a mission to the site in October 1998 and concluded that, although there is the economic need for a marina, it opposed this particular project for the negative impact it would have on the World Heritage values of the site. It recommended that an alternative location be sought for the marina.

The Observer of Portugal stressed the need for a marina in Angra do Heroismo and that this marina would not affect the values of the site. He also informed about the actions taken with respect to the underwater heritage in the Bay of Angra de Heroismo. ICOMOS confirmed that this had been done according to the highest standards.

The Committee expressed concerns and preoccupation about the location and impact of the marina on the World Heritage values of the site. While recognizing the economic need for a marina, it was of the opinion that this should be considered in the context of an overall conservation plan for the site. It encouraged the State Party to continue its dialogue with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee in order to find the best solution. It requested that the Committee be kept informed periodically on further developments in this matter.

#### **VII.40 Burgos Cathedral (Spain)**

The Committee took note of the confirmation by the Observer of Spain that planning for the hill and Fortress of Burgos had been suspended and that no works would be undertaken.

The Committee requested the State Party to keep the Secretariat informed of any new development in this matter.

#### **VII.41 The Rock Carvings in Tanum (Sweden)**

At the invitation of the Director of Monuments and Sites of the County Administration of Västra Götaland, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre undertook a mission to Tanum in September 1998 to discuss the E6 road upgrading project, funded by the European Union.

The mission examined various options for the road and expressed preference for alternatives that would avoid the World Heritage site. However, it was felt that one alternative solution, developed during the mission, although passing into the World Heritage site, would have a minimum impact on the continuity of the landscape of the World Heritage site and would not affect the rock carving sites as such.

The Committee expressed its appreciation of the fact that it was consulted on this project at such an early stage of its implementation. It recommended this consultation as a desirable precedent to other States Parties. Furthermore, it requested the State Party to study further the possibility of utilizing the Blue Route, passing to the west of the World Heritage site. In the event that this had to be precluded for engineering, social, and/or financial reasons, the Committee requested the State Party to carry out further study on the alternative route through the World Heritage site as developed during the mission.

The Committee requested the State Party to present a progress report on the E6 project, by 15 April 1999, to be examined by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

#### **VII.42 World Heritage sites in Central America**

The Secretariat reported that Hurricane Mitch swept over Central America during the final days of October 1998, causing heavy rains and storms and inundating important parts of Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador. The region has a number of World Heritage sites, including:

El Salvador:	Joya de Ceren Archaeological Site
Guatemala:	Tikal National Park Antigua Guatemala Archaeological Park and Ruins of Quirigua
Honduras:	Maya site of Copan Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (on the Danger List)
Nicaragua:	The site of Leon Viejo, recognised by the Bureau as having World Heritage values, but not inscribed as yet.

The Secretariat informed of serious flooding in the excavated areas of the extremely fragile site of Joya de Ceren in El Salvador as well as damage to the roofs that protect the excavated structures. A request for emergency assistance for an amount of US\$ 35,000 was under consideration by the Chairperson. Serious damage was also reported to Leon Viejo in Nicaragua. During the session, the Observer of Guatemala informed that no major damage had occurred to the monuments of Tikal or Quirigua, but that flooding destroyed the infrastructure at Quirigua and had left behind a thick layer of mud in Quirigua and Antigua Guatemala. Some churches in Antigua Guatemala were also affected. No information had been obtained on the properties in Honduras.

The Committee expressed its sincere regrets and serious concern about the loss of life and destruction caused by Hurricane Mitch in the countries of Central America. It expressed its readiness to collaborate with the authorities in the States Parties concerned in assessing damage that may have been caused to the World Heritage in the region and in taking remedial actions that may be necessary for their preservation or restoration.

The Committee requested the Secretariat to transmit the above to the States Parties concerned and to provide, jointly with the advisory bodies, a full report on the conditions of the World Heritage in the region to the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

During the examination of this matter, ICOMOS stressed the need to incorporate risk preparedness schemes in overall planning activities. It drew the attention of the Committee to the Manual for Risk Preparedness for Cultural Properties that it recently published in collaboration with ICCROM with funds provided from the World Heritage Fund.

**b) Reports on the state of conservation of cultural properties noted by the Committee**

**VII.43** The Committee noted the decisions of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau as reflected in the Report of the Bureau session (Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/5) and included in Annex IV of this report on the following properties:

**Rapa Nui National Park (Chile)**  
**The Mountain Resort and Its Outlying Temples in Chengde (China)**  
**The Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)**  
**Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu (China)**  
**Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China)**  
**City of Quito (Ecuador)**  
**Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)**  
**Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt)**  
**Islamic Cairo (Egypt)**

**Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia)**

The Observer of Estonia informed the Committee that the case of the new theatre is only one of the problems encountered in the preservation of the historic centre of the city and that the State Party will be requesting further assistance from the World Heritage Centre in planning and preservation matters.

**Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town in Quedlinburg (Germany)**

**Historic Centre of Florence (Italy)**

The Delegate of Italy informed the Committee that the high tension power line is located outside of the jurisdiction of the Municipality of Florence and that it would not be visible from the World Heritage site which is limited to the Historic Centre of the city. Consultations are underway between the Ministry for Cultural Properties and Activities, the Ministry of Industry and the electricity company to mitigate its impact. In general terms, he called upon States Parties and experts to look into the problems posed by power lines and to develop appropriate new technologies for the transmission of energy that would avoid negative visual impact on valuable landscapes and historic sites.

**Quseir Amra (Jordan)**  
**Luang Prabang (Laos)**  
**Baalbek (Lebanon)**  
**Tyre (Lebanon)**  
**Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)**  
**Old Towns of Djenné (Mali)**  
**City of Cusco (Peru)**  
**Archaeological site of Chavin (Peru)**  
**Historic Centre of Lima (Peru)**

**The Baroque Churches of the Philippines (The Philippines)**

The Observer of the Philippines informed the Committee that reports on the training activity had been recently submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

**Historic Centre of Porto (Portugal)**  
**Island of Gorée (Senegal)**  
**Sacred City of Anuradhapura (Sri Lanka)**  
**Ancient City of Polonnaruwa (Sri Lanka)**  
**Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)**  
**Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)**

**Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)**

On the request of the Observer of Finland, the Secretariat and the Observer of Turkey confirmed that the Zeyrek Conservation Site forms part of the areas inscribed on the World Heritage List.

**Kiev: Saint Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)**  
**Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam)**  
**Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)**

**VII.44** The Delegate of Italy informed the Committee that on 4 November 1998 a fire occurred in a part of the attic of the Royal Palace at Caserta, but that damage had been restricted to less monumental spaces and the roof. Restoration works have already been initiated.

**VIII. INFORMATION ON TENTATIVE LISTS AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER AND THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**VIII.1** The Committee did not recommend any properties to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**VIII.2** The Committee recalled that, having examined the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it had decided to delete the following two properties from the List:

**Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia)**

On the basis of a substantive report on the state of conservation submitted by the authorities of Croatia, the positive advice of ICOMOS on the restoration works undertaken and the recommendations of the Bureau, the Committee decided to delete the Old City of Dubrovnik from the List of World Heritage in Danger (see also paragraph VII.17 of this report).

**Wieliczka Salt Mines (Poland)**

Considering the positive impact of the dehumidifying equipment on the conditions of the historic sculptures, chambers and passages in the Salt Mine, and following ICOMOS' advice, the

Committee decided to delete the Wieliczka Salt Mines from the List of World Heritage in Danger (see also paragraph VII.20 of this report).

## EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF CULTURAL AND NATURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

**VIII.3** The Committee noted that a number of sites have been withdrawn by the States Parties concerned since the twenty-second session of the Bureau (June 1998): Cultural Stratification in the Historic Centre of the City of Pecs, Hungary (853); Gdansk : the Main Town, the Motlava Side Channel, and the Vistula Mouth Fortress, Poland (882); The Medieval Town of Provins, France (873), and the Archaeological Ensemble of Tarraco, Spain (875).

### A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

#### A.1 Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands</b>
Id. N°	<b>877</b>
State Party	<b>New Zealand</b>
Criteria	<b>N (ii)(iv)</b>

The site consists of five island groups (the Snares, Bounty Islands, Antipodes Islands, Auckland Islands, and Campbell Island) in the Southern Ocean south-east of New Zealand. The islands, lying between the Antarctic and Sub-tropical Convergences, and the seas have a high level of productivity, bio-diversity, wildlife population densities, and endemism among birds, plants and invertebrates. The bird and plant life, especially endemic albatrosses, cormorants, land birds and "megaherbs" are unique to these islands and are clearly of outstanding universal value under criterion (iv). Under criterion (ii) the islands display a pattern of immigration of species, diversification and emergent endemism. Several evolutionary processes such as the development of loss of flight in both birds and invertebrates offer particularly good opportunities for research into the dynamics of island ecology. Human impacts are confined to the effects of introduced species at Auckland and Campbell islands but their ongoing eradication is leading to a recovery of native vegetation allowing evolutionary processes to continue.

The Committee inscribed this property under criteria (ii) and (iv). The Committee noted the Bureau's comments, which commended the State Party for submitting a model nomination but at the same time expressed its concern over the integrity of the marine area and the conservation of the marine resources. The need for co-operation with the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) in elaborating strategies for strengthening the protection of the marine environment (especially regarding fishery by-catch) was noted. The Committee recalled that at its twenty-first session it had encouraged the Australian authorities to consider for the future a re-nomination of Macquarie Island with the Sub-Antarctic Islands of New Zealand as one single Sub-Antarctic site. It invited both States Parties to continue to liaise on this possibility.

The Delegate of Australia underlined the willingness of her Government to co-operate with New Zealand in considering a single site. The Observer of New Zealand informed the Committee that the responsible Minister would meet his Australian counterpart the following week and would discuss this issue, and that New Zealand is in contact with the Secretariat of CCAMLR. His Government participated in the seventeenth

CCAMLR meeting in Hobart, which discussed prohibition of daylight fishing and alternative mitigation measures for the Antarctic waters.

Property	<b>Golden Mountains of Altai</b>
Id. N°	<b>768 Rev.</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>
Criteria	<b>N (iv)</b>

The Altai region is an important and original centre of biodiversity of plant and animal species. It contains rare and endemic species, including the Snow Leopard. The Altai population of the Snow Leopard serves as a core source for the southern Siberian region. The site also displays the geological history of Asia, a variety of landscapes and ecosystems and contains excellent examples of glacial features.

The Committee discussed whether to apply criterion (iii) and reviewed the situation of the management plans for the different clusters of the site. The Delegate of Thailand in referring to the Operational Guidelines, stated that the management plan should ideally be complete before the inscription of the site.

The Committee decided to inscribe the site for its rich biodiversity and as the global centre of origin of montane flora of northern Asia under natural criterion (iv).

The Committee urged the State Party to complete management plan for all of the three areas as soon as possible and suggested that other States Parties may wish to assist with this. It furthermore encouraged the State Party to start a co-operative process with neighbouring States Parties to consider a possible transboundary expansion. The Observer of the Russian Federation informed the Committee that his Government is continuing the efforts to complete all management plans.

Property	<b>East Rennell</b>
Id. N°	<b>854</b>
State Party	<b>Solomon Islands</b>
Criteria	<b>N(ii)</b>

East Rennell is part of Rennell Island, the southernmost of the Solomon Islands group. Rennell, the largest raised coral atoll in the world, is 86 km long and 15 km wide and covers an area of 87,500ha. A major feature is Lake Tegano, which was the former lagoon on the atoll and is the largest lake in the insular Pacific (15,500ha). Rennell is mostly covered with dense forest with a canopy averaging 20m in height. East Rennell is of outstanding universal value under natural criterion (ii), demonstrating significant on-going ecological and biological processes and is an important site for the science of island biogeography. These processes relate to the role of East Rennell as a stepping-stone in the migration and evolution of species in the western Pacific and for speciation processes underway, especially with respect to the avifauna. Combined with the strong climatic effects of frequent cyclones, the site is a true natural laboratory for scientific study.

Following the Bureau's request at its twenty-second session concerning the application of cultural criteria, the Solomon Islands Government indicated that this would be further investigated. The Bureau had also sought further information on the development and implementation of a resource management plan bearing in mind that the land concerned is under customary ownership. The State Party advised that while a draft World Heritage Protection Bill is not yet ready to proceed through the legislative process, it has committed itself to the protection of any World Heritage site. The State Party pointed out that the rights of

customary owners in customary law are acknowledged in the Constitution of the Solomon Islands and the Customs Recognition Act of 1995. The State Party also indicated that members of the East Rennell community have agreed to the concept of World Heritage Listing of their land and are working with the State Party and a facilitator provided by the New Zealand Government to prepare a resource management plan. IUCN reported that the document entitled “East Rennell Resource Management Objectives and Guidelines” had been provided and reviewed and was considered to be acceptable in meeting the requirements for World Heritage inscription, even though it may be some years before the final resource management plan is completed.

The Committee had a considerable debate on customary protection and agreed that customary management should be supported. It pointed out that while traditional protection and management mechanisms are provided for in the Operational Guidelines for cultural sites (par. 24 b(ii)), no similar provision exists for natural sites (par. 44 b (vi)) and that this item would be discussed under the agenda item “Operational Guidelines”. A number of delegates welcomed the nomination and noted that a site protected by customary law is breaking new ground, and that the inclusion of this type of property is in line with the Global Strategy. Sites from other States Parties, which are under traditional management and customary law, may provide examples for general principles.

The Delegate of Thailand stated that although he had no doubt about the World Heritage values of the site, he could not support the nomination at this stage, as it did not comply with the requirements of the Operational Guidelines. He noted that customary land tenure does not automatically guarantee effective customary management and that there are no legislative provisions to protect the site from rapid changes such as tourism, which may affect it. He therefore dissociated himself from the Committee’s decision.

The Committee inscribed the site under natural criterion (ii). The Committee recommended that the State Party should proceed with the preparation of the Resource Management Plan and the draft national World Heritage Protection Bill and that a mission be undertaken in three years time to assess progress made.

The Observer of the Solomon Islands thanked the Committee and stated that his office is constantly working on the conservation of the site and that customary protection often hinders development. He noted that a number of NGOs, including WWF, The Nature Conservancy and Greenpeace are working in the Solomon Islands to enhance environmental awareness and sustainable development. His Government finalized the Environmental Conservation Bill, which is a milestone in the conservation and shows the commitment to heritage protection. The Chairperson congratulated the Solomon Islands for the inscription of their first site on the World Heritage List.

#### **A.2 Properties which the Committee did not inscribe on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Vodlozero National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>767</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>

The Committee noted that the site consists of boreal forest ecosystems of the Eurasian taiga and is an important bird breeding area. It is of European importance, but on its own, does not meet any natural World Heritage criteria. The Committee took note of the rich cultural heritage of the region and

encouraged the State Party to consider nomination the area for cultural values.

The Committee decided not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List. The Committee noted the possibility of Vodlozero being considered as part of a serial site proposal being developed by the State Party for the Green Belt of Fennoscandia. The Delegate of Finland informed the Committee that the Scandinavian countries are ready to assist with this proposal and would also provide support for the assessment of cultural values. The Observer from Russia indicated that his Government would continue to work on a proposed serial site.

Property	<b>Bashkirian Ural</b>
Id. N°	<b>879</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>

The Committee noted that the site is of European importance for the study of the natural dynamics of broadleaf forests. However, the site does not possess outstanding universal value. The proposal that this site could be considered as a Biosphere Reserve was noted and it was agreed that the State Party would follow this up with IUCN and UNESCO.

The Committee decided not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>The Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and Dobsinska Ice Cave</b>
Id. N°	<b>858</b>
State Party	<b>Slovakia</b>

The Committee recalled that the Bureau at its twenty-second session decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party asking the Slovak authorities to consider incorporating the Dobsinska Ice Cave portion into the nearby World Heritage site of the Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst. The Committee was informed that the State Party indicated a number of options including as a possible addition to the cultural World Heritage site of “Spissky Castle with its surroundings”.

The Committee noted that the natural values of the Ravines of the Slovak Paradis and the Dobsinska Ice Cave are considered to be of national and regional significance. The current nomination thus does not meet natural World Heritage criteria. The Committee did not inscribe the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegate of Hungary said he was not fully satisfied with the recommendation of the Bureau not to inscribe the site, since he was aware that the Dobsinska Ice Cave could be considered in its own right. He noted that the scientific importance of the Ice Cave which was more significant at this site than anywhere else in the world. Therefore Hungary supported reconsideration of this matter and a possible inscription of this part of the site at a later stage.

The Observer of the Slovak Republic stated that his Government has reconsidered previous statements made and accepts the recommendations made by the Bureau and IUCN. He asked if the Committee could consider the options of a separate nomination of the Dobsinska Ice Cave or as a possible extension to the transborder site of the Caves of Aggtelek Karst and Slovak Karst. He informed the Committee that his Government withdraws the remaining portions of the Ravines and Slovak Paradise, which are intended to be considered in relation to a future mixed nomination, which will be prepared subsequently.

The Chairperson encouraged the State Party, the Centre and IUCN to co-operate in the preparation of a revised nomination which may be presented to the twenty-third session of the Committee and its Bureau.

## B. CULTURAL HERITAGE

**VIII.4** The Committee was informed that all the cultural properties proposed for inscription figure on the tentative lists of the respective countries mentioned in Document WHC-98/CONF.203/9: Information on Tentative Lists. The Delegate of Benin indicated that “The W Reserve of Niger and its Vernacular Habitat of North Benin” was a mixed property, and requested that this information be reflected in the above-mentioned document. The Delegate of Lebanon furthermore wished that the information contained in the Document WHC-98/CONF.203/9 be accompanied by a regional analysis to guide the States Parties in the choice of new proposals for inscription and provide the advisory bodies with a planning tool.

### B.1 Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>The Semmering Railway</b>
Id. N°	<b>785</b>
State Party	<b>Austria</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Semmering Railway represents an outstanding technological solution to a major physical problem in the construction of early railways.

*Criterion (iv):* With the construction of the Semmering Railway, areas of great natural beauty became more easily accessible and as a result these were developed for residential and recreational use, creating a new form of cultural landscape.

Several delegates supported this inscription as it reflected the inclusion on the World Heritage List of new categories of properties.

Property	<b>Flemish Béguinages</b>
Id. N°	<b>855</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Flemish *béguinages* demonstrate outstanding physical characteristics of urban and rural planning and a combination of religious and traditional architecture in styles specific to the Flemish cultural region.

*Criterion (iii):* The *béguinages* bear exceptional witness to the cultural tradition of independent religious women in north-western Europe in the Middle Ages.

*Criterion (iv):* The *béguinages* constitute an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble associated with a religious movement characteristic of the Middle Ages associating both secular and conventual values.

Property	<b>The Four Lifts on the Canal du Centre and their Environs, La Louvière and Le Roeulx (Hainault)</b>
Id. N°	<b>856</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii):* The boat-lifts of the Canal du Centre bear remarkable testimony to the hydraulic engineering developments of 19th-century Europe.

*Criterion (iv):* These boat-lifts represent the apogee of the application of engineering technology to the construction of canals.

Property	<b>La Grand- Place, Brussels</b>
Id. N°	<b>857</b>
State Party	<b>Belgium</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Grand-Place is an outstanding example of the eclectic and highly successful blending of architectural and artistic styles that characterizes the culture and society of this region.

*Criterion (iv):* Through the nature and quality of its architecture and of its outstanding quality as a public open space, the Grand-Place illustrates in an exceptional way the evolution and achievements of a highly successful mercantile city of northern Europe at the height of its prosperity.

In thanking the Committee for these first Belgian inscriptions to the List, the Observer of Belgium offered his country's services in reducing the imbalance of representativity of African countries in the World Heritage List, in the framework of the Global Strategy and the Programme Africa 2009.

Property	<b>El Fuerte de Samaipata</b>
Id. N°	<b>883</b>
State Party	<b>Bolivia</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iii)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The sculptured rock at Samaipata is the dominant ceremonial feature of an urban settlement that represents the apogee of this form of prehispanic religious and political centre.

*Criterion (iii):* Samaipata bears outstanding witness to the existence in this Andean region of a culture with highly developed religious traditions, illustrated dramatically in the form of immense rock sculptures.

Property	<b>The Summer Palace, an Imperial Garden in Beijing</b>
Id. N°	<b>880</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C(i)(ii)(iii)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i):* The Summer Palace in Beijing is an outstanding expression of the creative art of Chinese landscape garden design, incorporating the works of humankind and nature in a harmonious whole.

*Criterion (ii):* The Summer Palace epitomizes the philosophy and practice of Chinese garden design, which played a key role in the development of this cultural form throughout the east.

*Criterion (iii):* The Imperial Chinese Garden, illustrated by the Summer Palace, is a potent symbol of one of the major world civilizations.

The Delegate of Thailand suggested that the wording of the citation from criterion (iii) would read better and also add dignity to this site if the proposed wording would read: “The Imperial Chinese Garden, together with the Summer Palace, is a potent symbol of one of the major world civilizations”. In short, the wording “illustrated by” be substituted by “together with”.

Property	<b>The Temple of Heaven: an Imperial Sacrificial Altar in Beijing</b>
Id. N°	<b>881</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>
Criteria	<b>C(i)(ii)(iii)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i):* The Temple of Heaven is a masterpiece of architecture and landscape design which simply and graphically illustrates a cosmogony of great importance for the evolution of one of the world’s great civilizations.

*Criterion (ii):* The symbolic layout and design of the Temple of Heaven had a profound influence on architecture and planning in the Far East over many centuries.

*Criterion (iii):* For more than two thousand years China was ruled by a series of feudal dynasties, the legitimacy of which is symbolized by the design and layout of the Temple of Heaven.

Property	<b>Choirokhoitia</b>
Id. N°	<b>848</b>
State Party	<b>Cyprus</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* In the prehistoric period, Cyprus played a key role in the transmission of culture from the Near East to the European world.

*Criterion (iii):* Choirokhoitia is an exceptionally well preserved archaeological site that has provided, and will continue to provide, scientific data of great importance relating to the spread of civilization from Asia to the Mediterranean world.

*Criterion (iv):* Both the excavated remains and the untouched part of Choirokhoitia demonstrate clearly the origins of proto-urban settlement in the Mediterranean region and beyond.

Several delegates supported the inscription of this property for its importance in the study of exchanges between the populations of the eastern Mediterranean and the process of urbanization.

Property	<b>The Gardens and Castle at Kromeriz</b>
Id. N°	<b>860</b>
State Party	<b>Czech Republic</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The ensemble at Kromeriz, and in particular the Pleasure Garden, played a significant role in the development of Baroque garden and palace design in central Europe.

*Criterion (iv):* The Gardens and Castle at Kromeriz are an exceptionally complete and well preserved example of a princely residence and its associated landscape of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Property	<b>Holašovice Historical Village Reservation</b>
Id. N°	<b>861</b>
State Party	<b>Czech Republic</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* Holašovice is of special significance in that it represents the fusion of two vernacular building traditions to create an exceptional and enduring style, known as South Bohemian Folk Baroque.

*Criterion (iv):* The exceptional completeness and excellent preservation of Holašovice and its buildings make it an outstanding example of traditional rural settlement in central Europe.

The Delegate of Mexico emphasized the importance of this inscription that demonstrates recognition by the Convention of vernacular heritage and underlines an additional aspect of the criterion for authenticity.

The Delegate of Hungary wholeheartedly supported this inscription and invited the State Party together with Slovakia to undertake a special regional evaluation of experiences, not always exclusively positive, with similar sites so as to be able to retain the values of these sites even after their exposure to a dramatically increased presence of tourists. The suggestion was warmly accepted by the Observer of the Czech Republic.

Property	<b>The Routes of Santiago de Compostela in France</b>
Id. N°	<b>868</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iv)(vi)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iv), and (vi)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The Pilgrimage Route of Santiago de Compostela played a key role in religious and cultural

exchange and development during the later Middle Ages, and this is admirably illustrated by the carefully selected monuments on the routes followed by pilgrims in France.

*Criterion (iv):* The spiritual and physical needs of pilgrims travelling to Santiago de Compostela were met by the development of a number of specialised types of edifice, many of which originated or were further developed on the French sections.

*Criterion (vi):* The Pilgrimage Route of Santiago de Compostela bears exceptional witness to the power and influence of Christian faith among people of all classes and countries in Europe during the Middle Ages.

Several delegates congratulated France on this inscription, particularly important for “itineraries”, a very useful concept for the evolution of world heritage. The Delegate of France, responding to a question raised by the Delegate of Thailand, stated that his country was ready to examine a joint inscription of the two sites of the Routes of Santiago de Compostela with Spain.

Property	<b>The Historic Site of Lyon</b>
Id. N°	<b>872</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* Lyon bears exceptional testimony to the continuity of urban settlement over more than two millennia on a site of great commercial and strategic significance, where cultural traditions from many parts of Europe have come together to create a coherent and vigorous continuing community.

*Criterion (iv):* By virtue of the special way in which it has developed spatially, Lyon illustrates in an exceptional way the progress and evolution of architectural design and town planning over many centuries.

The Delegate of Finland, had doubted at the meeting of the twenty-second session of the Bureau the universal significance of this nomination. He now expressed his support for this nomination not as an example unusual for its homogenous urban structure, but on the contrary of its very additive character.

Property	<b>Classical Weimar</b>
Id. N°	<b>846</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>
Criteria	<b>C(iii)(vi)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (vi)*:

*Criterion (iii):* The high artistic quality of the public and private buildings and parks in and around the town testify to the remarkable cultural flowering of the Weimar Classical Period.

*Criterion (vi):* Enlightened ducal patronage attracted many of the leading writers and thinkers in Germany, such as Goethe, Schiller, and Herder to Weimar in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, making it the cultural centre of the Europe of the day.

The Delegate of Thailand asked if the nomination of Weimar could stand alone on the basis of criterion (iii). ICOMOS responded that

indeed it could, but underscored the linkage between criterion (iii) and (vi) in respect of this nomination.

The Delegate of Germany informed the Committee that Weimar would be the cultural capital of Europe in 1999 and that the German authorities would take the necessary measures in conformity with the obligations of the Convention to accommodate the increase in the number of visitors due to this event.

The Observer of Poland commended this inscription. His statement is attached as Annex VI.1 to this report.

Property	<b>The Archaeological Area and the Patriarchal Basilica of Aquileia</b>
Id. N°	<b>825</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii), (iv), and (vi)*:

*Criterion (iii):* Aquileia was one of the largest and most wealthy cities of the Early Roman Empire.

*Criterion (iv):* By virtue of the fact that most of ancient Aquileia survives intact and unexcavated, it is the most complete example of an Early Roman city in the Mediterranean world.

*Criterion (vi):* The Patriarchal Basilican Complex in Aquileia played a decisive role in the spread of Christianity into central Europe in the early Middle Ages.

Property	<b>The Historic Centre of Urbino</b>
Id. N°	<b>828</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* During its short cultural pre-eminence, Urbino attracted some of the most outstanding humanist scholars and artists of the Renaissance, who created there an exceptional urban complex of remarkable homogeneity, the influence of which carried far into the rest of Europe.

*Criterion (iv):* Urbino represents a pinnacle of Renaissance art and architecture, harmoniously adapted to its physical site and to its medieval precursor in an exceptional manner.

The Delegate of France commended the management of this site at both the local and national levels.

Property	<b>The Cilento and Vallo di Diano National Park with the Archeological sites of Paestum and Velia and the Certosa di Padula</b>
Id. N°	<b>842</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>
Criteria	<b>C(iii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site as a cultural landscape on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii):* During the prehistoric period, and again in the Middle Ages, the Cilento region served as a key route for cultural, political, and commercial communications in an



exceptional manner, utilizing the crests of the mountain chains running east-west and thereby creating a cultural landscape of outstanding significance and quality.

*Criterion (iv):* In two key episodes in the development of human societies in the Mediterranean region, the Cilento area provided the only viable means of communications between the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian Seas, in the central Mediterranean region, and this is vividly illustrated by the relict cultural landscape of today.

Property	<b>Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara</b>
Id. N°	<b>870</b>
State Party	<b>Japan</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)</b>

The Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv)* and added *criterion (vi)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The historic monuments of ancient Nara bear exceptional witness to the evolution of Japanese architecture and art as a result of cultural links with China and Korea which were to have a profound influence on future developments.

*Criterion (iii):* The flowering of Japanese culture during the period when Nara was the capital is uniquely demonstrated by its architectural heritage.

*Criterion (iv):* The layout of the Imperial Palace and the design of the surviving monuments in Nara are outstanding examples of the architecture and planning of early Asian capital cities.

*Criterion (vi):* The Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines of Nara demonstrate the continuing spiritual power and influence of these religions in an exceptional manner.

The Delegate of Thailand proposed the inscription of this site on the basis of criterion (vi) as well as the other three. Following on other situations in which criterion (vi) was applied, the Committee by consensus agreed that in this case the use of criterion (vi), in combination with the other criteria, was fully justified.

Property	<b>Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab)</b>
Id. N°	<b>850</b>
State Party	<b>Lebanon</b>
Criteria	<b>C(iii)(iv)</b>

Following clarification of the buffer zone by the State Party, the Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii):* The Qadisha Valley has been the site of monastic communities continuously since the earliest years of Christianity. The trees in the Cedar Forest are survivors of a sacred forest and of one of the most highly prized building materials of the ancient world.

*Criterion (iv):* The monasteries of the Qadisha Valley are the most significant surviving examples of this fundamental demonstration of Christian faith.

Property	<b>The Archaeological Zone of Paquimé, Casas Grandes</b>
Id. N°	<b>560rev</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this property on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (iii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (iii):* Paquimé Casas Grandes bears eloquent and abundant testimony to an important element in the cultural evolution of North America, and in particular to prehispanic commercial and cultural links.

*Criterion (iv):* The extensive remains of the archaeological site of Paquimé Casas Grandes provide exceptional evidence of the development of adobe architecture in North America, and in particular of the blending of this with the more advanced techniques of Mesoamerica.

The Delegate of Morocco asked if criterion (v) could be used in this case. ICOMOS clarified that criterion (v) is for use in cases of living traditional human settlements.

Property	<b>The Historic Monuments Zone of Tlacotalpan</b>
Id. N°	<b>862</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii):* The urban layout and architecture of Tlacotalpan represent a fusion of Spanish and Caribbean traditions of exceptional importance and quality.

*Criterion (iv):* Tlacotalpan is a Spanish colonial river port on the Gulf coast of Mexico that has preserved its original urban fabric to an exceptional degree. Its outstanding character lies in its townscape of wide streets, modest houses in an exuberant variety of styles and colours, and many mature trees in public and private open spaces.

The Delegates of Brazil and Ecuador underscored the universal significance of this site for all of Latin America and commended the Mexican authorities on their conservation and management of the site.

Property	<b>Ir.D.F. Woudagemaal (D.F. Wouda Steam Pumping Station)</b>
Id. N°	<b>867</b>
State Party	<b>The Netherlands</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i)(ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i), (ii), and (iv)*:

*Criterion (i):* The advent of steam as a source of energy provided the Dutch engineers with a powerful tool in their millennial task of water management, and the Wouda installation is the largest of its type ever built.

*Criterion (ii):* The Wouda Pumping Station represents the apogee of Dutch hydraulic engineering, which has provided the models and set the standards for the whole world for centuries.

*Criterion (iv):* The Wouda pumping installations bear exceptional witness to the power of steam in controlling the forces of nature, especially as applied to water handling by Dutch engineers.

The Delegates of Thailand and Greece, while agreeing with the inscription of the site, expressed their reservation with the application of criterion (i).

Property	<b>Prehistoric Rock Art Sites in the Côa Valley</b>
Id. N°	<b>866</b>
State Party	<b>Portugal</b>
Criteria	<b>C (i)(iii)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (i) and (iii)*:

*Criterion (i)*: The Upper Palaeolithic rock-art of the Côa valley is an outstanding example of the sudden flowering of creative genius at the dawn of human cultural development.

*Criterion (iii)*: The Côa Valley rock art throws light on the social, economic, and spiritual life on the life of the early ancestor of humankind in a wholly exceptional manner.

The Delegate of Thailand agreed with the inscription but expressed his reservation with the application of criterion (i). The Delegates of Australia and Morocco warmly welcomed this nomination for contributing to the diversity and credibility of the World Heritage List and commended the State Party on its management of the site.

Property	<b>Rock Art of the Mediterranean Basin on the Iberian Peninsula</b>
Id. N°	<b>874</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (iii)</b>

The Committee inscribed this property on the basis of *criterion (iii)*.

*Criterion (iii)*: The corpus of late prehistoric mural paintings in the Mediterranean basin of eastern Spain is the largest group of rock-art sites anywhere in Europe and provides an exceptional picture of human life in a seminal period of human cultural evolution.

Property	<b>The University and Historic Precinct of Alcalá de Henares</b>
Id. N°	<b>876</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iv)(vi)</b>

The Committee inscribed this property on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: Alcalá de Henares was the first city to be designed and built solely as the seat of a university, and was to serve as the model for other centres of learning in Europe and the Americas.

*Criterion (iv)*: The concept of the ideal city, the City of God (*Civitas Dei*), was first given material expression in Alcalá de Henares, from where it was widely diffused throughout the world.

*Criterion (vi)*: The contribution of Alcalá de Henares to the intellectual development of humankind finds expression in its materialization of the *Civitas Dei*, in the advances in linguistics that took place there, not least in the definition of the Spanish language, and through the work of its great son, Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra and his masterpiece, *Don Quixote*.

The Delegate of Thailand, while agreeing with the inscription, expressed his reservation on the application of criterion (vi).

The Delegate of Morocco added that the Islamic origins of the city are important to note. The Delegate of Mexico commended the preservation and management of this site in view of its proximity to a large urban centre.

Property	<b>The Naval Port of Karlskrona</b>
Id. N°	<b>871</b>
State Party	<b>Sweden</b>
Criteria	<b>C (ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee inscribed the site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii) and (iv)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: Karlskrona is an exceptionally well preserved example of a European planned naval town, which incorporates elements derived from earlier establishments in other countries and which was in its turn to serve as the model for subsequent towns with similar functions.

*Criterion (iv)*: Naval bases played an important role in the centuries during which naval power was a determining factor in European *Realpolitik*, and Karlskrona is the best preserved and most complete of those that survive.

The Delegate of Canada expressed appreciation for the comprehensive nature of this inscription.

The Observer of Sweden thanked the Committee and pledged to protect the World Heritage values for which the property had been inscribed.

Property	<b>Archaeological site of Troy</b>
Id. N°	<b>849</b>
State Party	<b>Turkey</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(iii)(vi)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), (iii), and (vi)*:

The archaeological site of Troy is of immense significance in the understanding of the development of European civilization at a critical stage in its early development. It is, moreover, of exceptional cultural importance because of the profound influence of Homer's *Iliad* on the creative arts over more than two millennia.

The Delegate of Thailand wholeheartedly supported this nomination, pointing out that the application of criterion (vi) in this case is entirely justified.

The State Party informed the Committee that cartographic maps would be provided to the Committee as soon as possible.

Property	<b>L'viv – The Ensemble of the Historic Centre</b>
Id. N°	<b>865</b>
State Party	<b>Ukraine</b>
Criteria	<b>C(ii)(v)</b>

The Committee inscribed this site on the World Heritage List on the basis of *criteria (ii), and (v)*:

*Criterion (ii)*: In its urban fabric and its architecture, L'viv is an outstanding example of the fusion of the architectural and artistic traditions of Eastern Europe with those of Italy and Germany.

*Criterion (v)*: The political and commercial role of L'viv attracted to it a number of ethnic groups with different cultural and religious traditions, who established separate yet interdependent communities within the city, evidence for which is still discernible in the modern townscape.

The Delegate of Hungary remarked that State Party would need to give increased attention to the management of tourism at this site.

The Observer of Poland commended the State Party for this nomination (see Annex VII.2 to this report). The Mayor of L'viv thanked the Committee and pledged to maintain and promote the plural cultural values of this property.

## B.2 Extension of a property already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Monuments of Oviedo and the Kingdom of the Asturias</b>
Id. N°	<b>312bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>
Criteria	<b>C(i)(ii)(iv)</b>

The Committee approved the extension of the Churches of the Kingdom of the Asturias to include the Cámara Santa, the Basilica of San Julián de los Prados, and La Foncalada in Oviedo, on the World Heritage List, under the existing *criteria (i), (ii) and (iv)*.

The Delegate of Canada commended the Representative of ICOMOS for his comprehensive and informative presentation. The Chairperson thanked ICOMOS on behalf of the members of the Committee.

## IX. FOLLOW-UP TO THE WORK OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODY OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**IX.1** At its twentieth session in December 1996, the Committee requested a Financial Audit of the World Heritage Fund for the year ending 31 December 1996 and a Management Review of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, the Committee established a Consultative Body “to take action on the proposal adopted by the Committee, to undertake a review of the way in which the World Heritage Centre has assisted the Committee in implementing the World Heritage Convention”.

**IX.2** At its twenty-first session in December 1997, the Committee had requested that the Consultative Body examine the following four issues and present a report to the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau:

1. Technical issues
2. Communications and Promotion
3. Management Review and Financial Audit
4. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-Raising Guidelines.

**IX.3** A meeting of the Consultative Body was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 29 and 30 April 1998. In accordance with the decision by the Consultative Body in December 1997, preliminary discussion papers on each of the four issues were prepared by designated members of the Consultative Body. These discussion papers then formed the basis of the Consultative Body's deliberations during their meeting in April 1998.

**IX.4** The Report of the Rapporteur of the meeting of the Consultative Body was adopted on 24 June 1998 and was subsequently discussed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and made specific recommendations to the World Heritage Committee. Some of the Bureau's recommendations have required substantial follow-up on the part

of the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies as well as by members of the Consultative Body.

**IX.5** The Chairperson thanked Professor Francioni (Italy) for having chaired the Consultative Body in 1998. He also thanked the members of the Consultative Body - Australia, Benin, Canada, France, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, the United States of America and Zimbabwe. He also thanked Greece for their contributions to the work of the Consultative Body. He commented that the intensive work on the complex issues faced by the Consultative Body was to be highly commended.

## 1. TECHNICAL ISSUES

**IX.6** The Delegate of Australia, who had prepared a discussion paper for the Consultative Body meeting in April, informed the Committee that the following technical issues were examined by the Consultative Body at the request of the twenty-first session of the Committee:

- (a) the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi);
- (b) the test of authenticity;
- (c) the imbalance of the World Heritage List; and
- (d) the implementation of the Global Strategy.

**IX.7** The Delegate of Australia, informed the Committee about the deliberations of the Consultative Body and also referred to some of the main findings of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, held in Amsterdam in March 1998 (Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7). She acknowledged that the discussion on the use of cultural criteria (i) and (vi) and the test of authenticity had benefited from written contributions from Greece, Malta and Zimbabwe. The contribution from Malta had proposed more detailed guidelines for the more stringent application of cultural criterion (i). The Delegate of Zimbabwe's contribution had focussed on the different understanding of authenticity in an African compared to a universal context. His paper also referred to the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage in Africa. Whilst noting that no change had been suggested to cultural criteria (i) and (vi) it was deemed necessary to suggest sparing use and a better definition of exactly how they should be used. She suggested that the advisory bodies may wish to review the qualifying conditions used to apply cultural criteria (i) and (vi) as part of their work to propose revisions to Section I of the Operational Guidelines.

**IX.8** The Delegate of Australia then made reference to discussions on the test of authenticity and the application of the conditions of integrity. For authenticity, the discussions had focused on the nature of authenticity as outlined in the Nara Declaration on Authenticity. The Delegate of Australia highlighted two issues that had emerged from discussions. Firstly she stressed the need for more rigour to deter over-restoration. She also indicated the need to understand the link between authenticity and cultural value. In this respect she expressed the overwhelming view of the Amsterdam meeting that authenticity provisions should be defined for each of the criteria used to justify properties for inclusion on the World Heritage List. Furthermore, she noted that when devising new authenticity and integrity provisions, reference also needed to be made to geo-cultural contexts.

**IX.9** The Delegate of Australia made reference to the recommendation of the twenty-second session of the Bureau that had asked, that in line with the discussions at the Global Strategy Expert Meeting in Amsterdam, further work be undertaken on breaking down the cultural themes outlined at the 1994 Global Strategy Experts Meeting into sub-themes that would assist identification of those types places that are over- or under-

represented on the World Heritage List. The Bureau had requested that this work should recognise the inseparability of natural and cultural heritage. The Delegate of Australia commented that for natural heritage a number of thematic studies have been carried out by IUCN in a global context. However, she noted the ICOMOS studies seemed to be based on types of properties rather than cultural themes.

**IX.10** The Delegate of Canada gave a brief report on the Global Strategy meeting held in Amsterdam in March 1998. She reminded the members of the Committee that following the expert meeting on natural heritage held in the Parc de la Vanoise in 1996, the twentieth session of the Committee had requested a truly joint natural and cultural heritage expert meeting to discuss the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List*. She informed the Committee that the Amsterdam meeting had addressed four main points – (i) the application of the conditions of integrity versus the test of authenticity; (ii) the question of a unified or a harmonized set of criteria; (iii) the notion of outstanding universal value and its application in different regional and cultural contexts; and, (iv) the credibility of the Convention and its implementation.

**IX.11** The Delegate of Canada referred the Committee to the recommendations made in the report of the Amsterdam meeting for, (i) the existing natural and cultural heritage criteria to be unified into one single set of criteria to better reflect the continuum between nature and culture (Table 2 of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7); and (ii) the conditions of integrity (to include reference to the notion of authenticity) to be applied to both natural and cultural heritage (Table 3 of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7). She noted that the experts at Amsterdam asked that the World Heritage List reflect the broad spectrum of natural and cultural diversity and the outstanding relationships between people and the environment.

**IX.12** With reference to the notion of outstanding universal value, the Delegate of Australia informed the Committee that a more regional and thematic approach to its interpretation deriving from broad themes and sub-themes had been recommended by the Amsterdam expert meeting. The expert group had noted that the implementation of the Global Strategy, using a regional and thematic approach, would be applied to fill in the gaps in the World Heritage List. The expert group had acknowledged that good progress had been made in this regard but had recommended that steps be taken to accelerate its implementation.

**IX.13** With regard to the credibility of the Convention and its implementation, the Delegate of Canada noted that the experts attending the Amsterdam meeting had stressed that inscription of a site on the World Heritage List is not a single event but part of a continuing process to ensure the protection of the values for which the site has been inscribed. The Delegate of Zimbabwe informed the Committee of the discussions on credibility of the Convention and its implementation that took place at the expert meeting in Amsterdam. He referred to the details of that discussion presented in Table 7 of Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7. He noted that the working group on credibility at the Amsterdam meeting had emphasized that the cornerstone of the credibility of the World Heritage List is the rigorous monitoring of properties and the political commitment of the States Parties to their protection.

**IX.14** With reference to the application of cultural criteria (i) and (vi), the Committee did not suggest revisions. A number of Committee members did however suggest that a better understanding of the application of both criteria is required and explanatory text to accompany the criteria could be formulated to assist in this regard. It was noted that in applying cultural

criterion (i), for example for rock art sites, it was important to go beyond reference to the ‘masterpiece of human creative genius’ to the landscape context which is inseparable to the meaning and prehistoric articulation of the landscape. The use of other cultural criteria and the three categories of cultural landscapes was noted as being important in this regard. A number of delegates and ICCROM stressed the need to finalise the work on bringing the natural and cultural criteria together and to expressing how they are to be used with greater clarity.

**IX.15** Several delegates referred to the differential regional applications of the notion of authenticity. The Delegate of Greece made a statement that is included in Annex VIII.

**IX.16** On the question of the balance of the List, the Committee emphasized that it was less useful to simply refer to the numbers of properties on the List than to assess the expressions of cultural and natural diversity and of cultural and natural themes from different regions represented on the List. Whilst some delegates noted that there are obstacles to achieving representation on the List in some regions and countries (for example, because of lack of awareness of the Convention or of technical and financial capacity etc.), others referred to the high numbers of nominations being presented to the World Heritage Committee each year. A number of delegates noted that the decision by the Committee concerning nominations are sometimes disconnected from the implementation of the Global Strategy as had been seen by the high number of European sites the Committee had inscribed on the World Heritage List at its twenty-second session. It was also noted that the interests of national authorities might differ from the objectives of the Global Strategy in relation to the inclusion of properties on the List. Currently the work of the Convention is highly respected in many countries, but the pressures on the entire system are substantive.

**IX.17** In this context, the need was stressed to move from recommendations to action and to assess the issue from a political perspective, basically founded on two aspects: the urgency of meeting the legitimate expectations of a substantial number of countries to be assisted in presenting applications for their sites; and the need for some countries to self-contain their ambitions. The Delegate of France expressed concern about the useful discussions concerning the balance of the List and the decisions taken by the Committee, emphasizing that the credibility of the latter was at stake. He insisted upon the importance of avoiding the perpetration of this imbalance. The Delegate of Finland proposed a moratorium on inscriptions, in order for the Committee and the World Heritage Centre to focus more on preparing applications for countries that are underrepresented on the List.

**IX.18** The Committee was of the general opinion that regionally specific approaches to the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List* (as adopted by the Committee as part of the Action Plan on the Global Strategy – see Section X) should be accelerated to ensure results. The Committee noted the need to use a more strategic approach to funding activities relating to underrepresented regions and themes.

**IX.19** The Representative of IUCN reinforced the importance of there being one World Heritage that recognizes the nature-culture continuum. IUCN informed the Committee that they had discussed the concept of this continuum with IUCN members on several occasions, including the World Conservation Congress (Montreal 1996). The concept of one single set of criteria and the issue of a credible and representative World Heritage List reflecting cultural and natural diversity had received support among the IUCN membership. The IUCN Representative referred to their continuing work on thematic studies with new partners, including the WWF Global 200 Programme. He

informed the Committee that IUCN sees further scope for cooperation with ICOMOS in relation to cultural landscapes, especially those with biodiversity values. He stated that the assessment of outstanding universal value in an international context and the maintenance of integrity and authenticity are key to ensuring the credibility of the World Heritage List.

**IX.20** The Representatives of ICOMOS wished that attention be given to the actual inscription of a property on the World Heritage List rather than to the criteria, which may be considered as tools for analysis and which, furthermore, need not be mentioned in the published List. They insisted upon the importance of regular communication with the site managers so that they may be well informed of the debates taking place and take into account the reality of the field. Finally, they were of the opinion that the objectives of the Convention should be re-affirmed, that they do not have as aim the establishment of a list of the most prestigious properties, but first and foremost to implement international co-operation for the safeguarding of humankind's cultural heritage.

**IX.22** The Chairperson thanked the Government of the Netherlands for hosting the Amsterdam Global Strategy meeting (March 1998) and the Committee, advisory bodies and observers for the rich and intensive debate. The Committee adopted the following decisions:

- 1) The Committee thanked the Delegate of Italy (who had chaired the Consultative Body in 1998) and all the members of the Consultative Body for their productive work on the technical issues and paid tribute to the work of the Global Strategy Expert Meeting held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in March 1998.
- 2) The Committee stressed the urgent need to establish a representative World Heritage List and considered it imperative to ensure more participation of those States Parties whose heritage is currently underrepresented on the World Heritage List. The Committee requested the Centre and the advisory bodies to actively consult with these States Parties to encourage and support their active participation in the implementation of the *Global Strategy for a credible and representative World Heritage List* through the concrete regional actions described in the *Global Strategy Action Plan* adopted by the Committee at its twenty-second session.
- 3) Given the purposes of the World Heritage Convention, the policy of the Committee regarding nominations should have two parts: (i) the Committee should value all nominations from all States Parties and (ii) the Committee should strategically expend its resources to increase nomination of sites from parts of the world which are presently not represented or underrepresented.
- 4) The Committee asked that when the Bureau examines new nominations at its future sessions, it take into account the debate of the twenty-second session of the Committee on the establishment of a representative World Heritage List.
- 5) The Committee requested the Centre to work with the advisory bodies, to further develop the revision of Section I of the Operational Guidelines and submit them to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau should submit for adoption its recommendations to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee.
- 6) The Committee urged the advisory bodies to pursue further work on breaking down the themes into sub-themes, taking into consideration the recommendations of relevant expert meetings. Particular attention should be given to secure the highest level of scientific and technical consensus. The

advisory bodies are asked to report on progress made and suggest any concrete decisions to be taken by future sessions of the Committee.

- 7) The Committee requested that the Centre, in collaboration with the advisory bodies present a progress report on the implementation of the regional actions described in the Global Strategy Action Plan adopted by the Committee at its twenty-second session to the twenty-third session of the Committee.
- 8) The Committee requested that an agenda item on "Ways and means to ensure a representative World Heritage List" be presented to the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in 1999. The twenty-third session of the Bureau is asked to prepare the agenda item for the General Assembly.

## 2. COMMUNICATIONS AND PROMOTION

**IX.22** The Consultative Body's work on communication and promotion was discussed under Agenda Item 13 and is included in Section XIII of the report.

## 3. MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND FINANCIAL AUDIT

### *Follow-up to the Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention*

**IX.23** Members of the Committee were reminded that the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" (Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.16) had been submitted to its twenty-first session in Naples, Italy in December 1997. The recommendations of the Management Review and Financial Audit were discussed at the April 1998 Consultative Body meeting with reference to a discussion paper prepared jointly by France and Italy. The twenty-second session of the Bureau examined the Report of the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and prepared a number of recommendations. The recommendations of the twenty-second session of the Bureau were presented to the twenty-second session of the Committee as Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/11.

**IX.24** A Progress Report on Follow-up to the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention" was included as Annex I of the above-mentioned document. The Committee could not examine the progress report in detail, due to time constraints.

The Committee adopted the following decision:

Having examined the work of the Consultative Body in 1998, the Committee requested the twenty-third session of the Bureau to examine the *Progress Report on Follow-up to the "Report of the External Auditor to the Director-General of UNESCO on the Management Review of the World Heritage Convention"* prepared by the Centre (Annex I of Document WHC-98/CONF.203/11). The twenty-third session of the Bureau is asked to present its own report and recommendations on the subject to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee for adoption.

### **Role and functions of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre**

**IX.25** At its twenty-second session, the Bureau requested that the Director-General of UNESCO provide a report outlining "the

tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention”.

**IX.26** At the request of the Committee, the Green Note entitled the ‘Preservation and Presentation of Cultural and Natural Heritage’ issued by the Director-General of UNESCO on 23 November 1998 was presented to the Committee in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/11 Add.

**IX.27** During a lengthy discussion, which focused on the future of the World Heritage Centre and the replacement of the Director of the Centre following his retirement, the Committee acknowledged that the Green Note was an internal document and does not constitute the report requested.

**IX.28** The Committee highlighted the important contribution of the Centre to the work of UNESCO, the Convention and the Committee. The Delegate of Canada described the Centre as reflecting the genius of the Convention in expressing the continuum between nature and culture.

**IX.29** The Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO stated that,

‘The Green Note is not the report requested by the Bureau and the Consultative Body from the Director-General. As you know, the World Heritage Committee has, itself, reaffirmed year after year, that the World Heritage Centre, created by the Director-General, should be considered as a unit of the Secretariat.

Consequently, it remains the prerogative of the Director-General to take, in particular by a Green Note, as he does for all units of the Secretariat, the measures he deems necessary for the organization and the functioning of the World Heritage Centre.

For the internal organizational questions of the Secretariat, the Director-General refers to procedures established by the General Conference and the Executive Board of UNESCO, which he has to consult.’

Subsequently, the Committee debated how best to express the vision they have for the future of the Centre. The Delegate of Thailand urged that the “distinct identity of the World Heritage Centre in UNESCO but outside the traditional sectoral structure” must be retained. The Delegate of Italy suggested alternative wording that was subsequently adopted (see paragraph 2 below.)

The Committee adopted the following decision:

1. The Committee expressed satisfaction and appreciation of the work of the World Heritage Centre under the direction of Mr von Droste, successfully bringing together work on the protection of both cultural as well as natural World Heritage.
2. The Committee is convinced that the World Heritage Centre should remain a unit specifically dedicated to provide Secretariat services to the World Heritage Convention under the direct authority of the Director-General.
3. The Committee believed that the recommendation of the twenty-second session of the Bureau in June 1998 addressed to the Director-General remains valid. Therefore, the Committee kindly requested the Director-General of UNESCO to prepare a report on the following points:

- the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre as Secretariat to the Convention;
- the modalities for intervention and co-operation with other specialized sectors of UNESCO in the field of World Heritage;
- the modalities for co-ordination of the other sectors with the World Heritage Centre;
- the way in which decisions are adopted and applied on the use of the funds related to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention;
- the tasks and functions of the World Heritage Centre with respect to the use of funds as Secretariat to the Convention.

The report is requested in due time for the twenty-third session of the Bureau to consider it and provide recommendations, if necessary, to the twenty-third session of the Committee.

The Centre is asked to circulate the report to all members of the Committee as soon as it becomes available.

**IX.30** The Representative of the Director-General stated that the Director-General has no intention to change the status of the Centre as a unit of UNESCO not forming part of the sectoral structure and under the direct authority of the Director-General.

**IX.31** The Delegates of Thailand and the United States of America asked that the report on this agenda item note that the Representative of the Director-General had affirmed in his statement, that the Centre would remain a distinct unit within UNESCO specifically assigned to work as the Secretariat of the Convention and would not be part of the traditional sectoral structure.

#### **4. USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM AND FUND-RAISING GUIDELINES**

**IX.32** The Secretariat briefly introduced the issue on the use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising, by recalling the step by step process followed by the Consultative Body in proposing new *Guidelines on the Use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising* to the Committee at its twenty-second session. The Secretariat further recalled that the document submitted to the Committee for examination within document WHC-98/CONF.203/11Add remained unchanged since it was last presented to the extraordinary session of the Bureau.

**IX.33** Concerning the use of the World Heritage Emblem, the Chairperson recalled discussions of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau and invited the Delegate of Canada, who had suggested amendments to the Guidelines prepared by Japan and the United States of America, to present them.

**IX.34** In presenting the proposed document, “Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem”, the Delegate of Canada informed the Committee that the proposal emanated from the Guidelines prepared by Japan and the United States of America (WHC-98/CONF.203/11Add) and was finalized in co-operation with these delegations. She underlined the fact that the document was not a new proposal, but a slightly modified version of the Japanese/USA Guidelines, presenting a more concise, but nevertheless self-contained document. She recalled that the adoption of the proposed Guidelines and Principles would entail a revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. She concluded by stating that, after having spent close to two years working on this issue and in view of the growing urgency of the

matter, the Committee should adopt guidelines to provide all concerned parties with a tool ensuring appropriate use of the Emblem.

**IX.35** While recognizing that the proposed Guidelines reflected the comments of the Secretariat to some extent, the representative of the UNESCO Publishing Office who participated in the debate, expressed reserve regarding the applicability of the Guidelines and quality control requirements proposed in the document. He stated that this might discourage media related companies (publishers, film producers, etc.) from requesting the use of the Emblem on World Heritage related information products.

**IX.36** During the discussions, concerns were raised on the legal aspects related to the protection of the Emblem and the implications of these aspects in terms of the responsibilities of the Committee and the States Parties to the Convention. The need for quality control of World Heritage site-specific products from States Parties was reaffirmed and considered indispensable.

**IX.37** A working group, composed of the Governments of Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America was established on a voluntary basis to continue working on this issue before the end of the session. The working group made amendments to the text to reflect the discussions of the Committee. The Delegate of the United States of America briefly presented the modifications made to the document. This new version of the document (attached as Annex XII to this report) was adopted by the Committee.

**IX.38** The Chairperson briefly introduced the Fund-raising Guidelines and reminded the Committee that the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO" have been in use within UNESCO since 1997 but have not yet been adopted by the Executive Board. Therefore, the Chairperson proposed that the Committee ask the Centre to work in accordance with the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO". The Committee agreed with the proposal and then adopted the decision as formulated.

## **X. PROGRESS REPORT, SYNTHESIS AND ACTION PLAN ON THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**X.1** The Chairperson introduced Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12 and the following information documents:

WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7

Report on the *World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Expert Meeting*, 25–29 March 1998, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.8

Report of the Regional Thematic Meeting on Cultural Landscapes in the Andes, Arquipa/Chivay, Peru, 17-22 May 1998 (English only)

WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.9

Synthetic Report of the 4<sup>th</sup> Global Strategy Meeting for Western Africa, Benin, 16-19 September 1998

**X.2** He recalled that the Agenda item was prepared in pursuance of a recommendation adopted by the Consultative Body and that its draft had been discussed with the advisory bodies: ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN. He underlined that the Committee would take note of the Information Documents and of Section I: Background to the Document, and Section II: Introduction to the Global Strategy for a representative and

credible World Heritage List. He pointed out that it was the first time that the Committee would be examining regional action plans for Africa, Arab States, Asia, the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean.

**X.3** The Secretariat then introduced Section III: Priority issues, Section IV: Regional Action Plans and Section V: Overall Action Plan.

**X.4** It was recalled that the report of the Expert Meeting on the Global Strategy and thematic studies for a representative World Heritage List in 1994 was examined by the Committee at its eighteenth session in 1994 at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris (Document WHC-94/CONF.003/INF.6). It also adopted the proposed Global Strategy for a representative World Heritage List at the time. The Committee had been concerned by a number of gaps and serious imbalances regarding the representation of regions, kinds of properties and historical periods on the List, as well as over-representation of architectural masterpieces of Europe. It recognized therefore the need to identify themes and areas whose investigation in their broad anthropological context would have high potential to complete gaps on the representation of the List. The Secretariat pointed out during the presentation of Section III "Priority issues" the:

- (i) continuing imbalances of new categories defined in the Operational Guidelines and still under-represented on the List, such as Cultural Landscapes, Routes and Itineraries. It deplored the absence of natural sites in the Amazon Basin, the low representation of heritage of Arctic and Sub-arctic regions, as well as the lack of implementation of the natural part of the World Heritage Convention in the Arab States. On the other hand, it noted the continuing increase in the number of categories of sites already represented. It underlined that little consideration had been given to paragraph 6 (vii) of the Operational Guidelines which "invites States Parties to consider whether their cultural heritage is already well represented on the List, and if so to slow down voluntarily their rate of future nominations".
- (ii) constraints faced by many States Parties whose heritage is still under-represented on the List, and which have inadequate legal protection and management mechanisms, as well as insufficient human and financial resources for the preservation and conservation of their heritage. Many of these States Parties cannot present "Preparatory Assistance" requests because of their arrears to the World Heritage Fund. The Secretariat also voiced the concern expressed at African Regional and Sub-Regional Experts meetings regarding the level of "Preparatory Assistance" which is limited to US\$ 15.000 and is deemed insufficient for the preparation of nominations files.

**X.5** Due to time constraints, the six regional action plans for Africa, Arab States, Asia, the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, were not presented in detail. However, the Secretariat underlined that each action plan provided complete information on: (i) the status of implementation of the World Heritage Convention, number of States Parties, tentative lists, natural and cultural sites as well as the categories of heritage still under-represented; (ii) activities undertaken since the adoption of the Global Strategy; (iii) an assessment of results and shortcomings which justify the rationale for (iv) an action plan for the year 1999-2000. These action plans presented detailed activities that addressed issues taking into account specific needs in each region with a view of achieving a more representative, diversified and credible World

Heritage List. These activities concerned natural and cultural heritage and underlined the continuum between nature and culture. However, bearing in mind the recommendation of the Consultative Body "to prepare a prioritised action plan to ensure an acceleration of the implementation of the Global Strategy", an overall action plan was also submitted to the Committee with reference to:

- (i) methods for communicating the objectives and regional and thematic approach of the Global Strategy to all States Parties which included (a) a modification of the Operational Guidelines as approved by the Committee at the present session; (b) as well as to the necessity of their translation into Spanish, Arabic, Russian, Chinese and national languages when deemed necessary; (c) and also an analysis of categories of heritage relevant to the geo-cultural context to be proposed at national and regional meetings of experts, in co-operation with the advisory bodies, thus promoting awareness of the present imbalances in the implementation of the Convention;
- (ii) ways of channeling and increasing resources available to States Parties to ensure sustainable conservation of World Heritage properties in the long term. In that respect, the World Heritage Centre will increase (a) its co-operation in conservation activities on World Heritage sites within UNESCO, with other international organizations, and bilateral donors, and remind the States Parties of their obligations under Paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines, (b) further development of regional training strategies in co-operation with ICCROM, (c) enlargement of professional and political networks amongst managers, decision-makers, administrators and professionals.

**X.6** During the debate, the Observer of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) presented the "Global 200" analysis, which is a comparative biological assessment leading to the selection of globally outstanding examples of the major habitat types on earth - marine, freshwater and terrestrial. This analysis has been presented in a map, the "Global 200 Ecoregions", which identifies the world's habitat priorities in all their extraordinary diversity. The "Global 200" could be a useful tool for States Parties to identify natural sites suitable for World Heritage Listing and to assist in fulfilling the Convention's unique role in securing conservation of natural sites of universal value. He noted the participation of the World Wide Fund for Nature in the forthcoming World Heritage Forest meeting in Sumatra, Indonesia, in December 1998.

**X.7** IUCN supported the Committee's efforts to establish a credible and balanced World Heritage List. It noted, however, that the main focus of the exercise should be output-oriented and clear goals and objectives should guide this process. IUCN has developed the technical working papers, as outlined in Document WHC/CONF.203/12, to help to define outstanding universal value with regard to natural heritage criteria for a credible World Heritage List. IUCN offers to strengthen co-operation with the Centre and the States Parties in this regard. The World Parks Congress in 2002 in Africa would be a key global event and will be held in Kenya or South Africa, and IUCN will work with the Centre to ensure that World Heritage is an integral element of this. IUCN emphasized that it fully endorses the effective linkage between nature and culture, which is particularly crucial for Small Island states (i.e the Caribbean and the Pacific). While the imbalance between natural and cultural heritage is significant, the main challenge is that of effective management of World Heritage sites. The yearly increase of the World Heritage List

may be a "ticking time bomb" and the continuing increase in nominations, if unchecked, could reduce World Heritage standards.

**X.8** ICOMOS recalled that its comparative studies had been so far reactive; and upon receipt of properties that had not previously been considered for the List, they had requested advice on criteria and methodology for evaluating them. However, they were engaged in more systematic comparative studies with TICCIH and Do Co Mo Mo and they held themselves ready to assist the Committee and States Parties to undertake a programme of comparative studies on regions whose heritage was still under-represented on the World Heritage List. ICCROM declared that it was pleased to note that the emphasis on training strategies and capacity building had been integrated in the Global Strategy approach.

**X.9** The Observer of Poland underlined the importance of Eastern Europe in the implementation of the Global Strategy, as the heritage of Eastern Europe is subject to rapid economic and social transformation. He noted with satisfaction that a seminar on cultural landscapes in Eastern and Central Europe is to be organized in 1999. He stated that his Government would be happy to host this meeting in the city of Gdansk. The Director of the Centre informed the Committee that an invitation has been also received from Slovakia and that it has to be discussed with the States Parties concerned.

**X.10** The Observer of the Netherlands informed the Committee that it was an honour for his Government to host the Global Strategy Expert Meeting, held in Amsterdam in March 1998 (see Information Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.7), and that the proceedings of the meeting are currently being published.

**X.11** The Delegate of Japan noted that in the proposed budget for activities in Asia in the year 2000 on page 51 of Document WHC-98/CONF.203/12, amounted only to US\$ 6,000 for the publication of the report of the South-East Asia Meeting to be held in 1999. Stating that this budget does not reflect the important needs and activities proposed as indicated in the regional action plan for Asia in the document, he asked the Secretariat to readjust the budget for the year 2000 and to give further thought on activities to improve the representation of Asian properties on the World Heritage List. Referring to the activities in Afghanistan proposed by the Centre, he stated Japan's strong interest in the protection of cultural heritage in Afghanistan, especially for the site of Bamiyan, and indicated his Government's willingness to consider the funding of activities if security conditions permit their implementation.

**X.12** The Delegate of Mexico remarked that Mexico organized in Mexico City in 1998 a regional course on the Convention and its application. He considered this course also of relevance for the Global Strategy as it specifically addressed matters such as representativity of the World Heritage List and identification of new types of cultural heritage properties.

**X.13** Representatives of South Africa and Benin commended the work of the Secretariat concerning the Global Strategy and said that they had witnessed the impact of the activities that had been undertaken so far. The Delegate of Benin stated that the process has already borne tangible results, but that it always takes time to increase capacity building and therefore, generate nominations in the region. The Delegate of South Africa recommended that the World Heritage Centre involve regional institutions, like the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and OAU, to accelerate the process of nominations and ratification. On the other hand, the Delegate of Benin requested the World Heritage Centre to organize information meetings with the delegations at UNESCO Headquarters, to inform them and



report on the activities undertaken within the framework of the Global Strategy. Reference was made to the 4th Global Strategy meeting for Western Africa held in Porto-Novo (Benin) in September 1998, which highlighted the importance of the intangible aspects inherent in the African heritage. The Delegate asked the Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage whether the lack of representativity of African heritage on the World Heritage List would entail that it would qualify more specifically for inscription on the list of humankind's oral and intangible masterpieces.

**X.14** In response to the question of the Delegate of Benin concerning the imbalance in representativity of the World Heritage List in Africa which would to a certain degree be counter-balanced by UNESCO's recent initiative in favour of humankind's oral and intangible heritage, the Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage indicated that it would be appropriate to refer to the work of the 154<sup>th</sup> and 155<sup>th</sup> sessions of the Executive Board concerning this item on the agenda. The statement by UNESCO on humankind's oral and intangible masterpieces should not be confused with the establishment of the World Heritage List, stemming from the implementation of an international convention (1972 Convention), even if, as in the case of the Place Djemaa Al Fna of Marrakesh, it may be complementary.

**X.15** Following the intervention by the Delegate of Japan concerning the heritage of Afghanistan, the Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage recalled that no Afghan property is inscribed on the World Heritage List to date. He informed the members of the Committee of a meeting which was organized on 30 September 1998 at UNESCO Headquarters by the Blue Shield International Committee (in collaboration with ICOM and ICOMOS), on the situation of Afghan heritage as well as the approval of a funds-in-trust agreement of US\$ 113,000 that Italy has granted to carry out emergency operations and encourage the presentation of sites and museums, more particularly the Kabul Museum.

**X.16** The Delegate of Finland noted that the proposed budget did not reflect the regional imbalances and that the budget for Europe for the year 2000 is proportionally too large in comparison to Asia, which seems inconsistent with the imbalance of the global strategy aims. She stated, however, that if the budget for Europe is for the under-represented Baltic States, the proposed budget for Europe would be justified.

**X.17** The Chairperson responded that the budget for the year 2000 is merely an indicative one and that the Committee is being requested to review and approve the activities and budget for 1999. He said, however, that the comments on the low budget for Asia for the year 2000 had been noted and he asked the Secretariat to look into this matter. He confirmed that the activities proposed for Europe were indeed to increase the number of nominations from Eastern and Central Europe as well as the Baltic States.

**X.18** At the end of the debate, the Director of the Centre promised that the actions for the year 2000 would be reviewed in the light of the discussion. The Chairperson commended the regional approach that would redress the imbalances of the World Heritage List. The prioritized action plan prepared as a follow-up of the Consultative Body concerning the implementation of the Global Strategy was endorsed. The activities foreseen in the regional action plans for 1999 presented under Section VI of the Working Document, were approved, and in addition: US\$ 15,000 for IUCN and US\$ 23,000 for ICOMOS.

## **Summary Workplan of regional activities approved in 1999 under Chapter II: Global Strategy**

### **1. AFRICA**

Publication of report and follow-up of the 4 <sup>th</sup> Global Strategy Meeting	3,000
Regional Thematic Global Strategy Meeting on Cultural Landscapes (40,000 approved in 1997)	8,000
	11,000

### **2. ARAB STATES**

Second Regional Study on the identification of potential natural sites (Publication and translation of the report in Arabic)	8,000
Seminar on Monuments (Publication and distribution of the report in Arabic)	30,000
	38,000

### **3. ASIA**

Publication and distribution of the report of the Central Asian Archaeological Heritage meeting	5,000
Completion of ongoing analysis on representativity of World Heritage Cultural sites in Asia in cooperation with ICOMOS and ICCROM	6,000
Mission and case study on Afghanistan to address issue of cultural properties in situation of armed conflicts	10,000
	21,000

#### 4. PACIFIC

Regional review of all protected areas including South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) initiated Community Based Conservation Area (CBCAs)	15,000
Support to Pacific participants to attend regional workshops and meetings	15,000
	30,000

#### 5. EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Expert meeting on Cultural Landscapes for Eastern and Central Europe and Baltic States	30,000
	30,000

#### 6. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Latin America	
Expert meeting on Cultural Landscapes in the Andean region (Publication of report in Spanish)	5,000
Expert meeting on Cultural Landscapes in Central America	25,000

The Caribbean	
The Cultural Heritage of the Caribbean and the World Heritage Convention (Publication and distribution of the report)	5,000
Compilation of existing studies of Caribbean natural and cultural heritage	10,000
Grand Total	45,000

#### TOTAL BY REGION

	<u>1999</u>
- Africa	11,000
- Arab States	38,000
- Asia	21,000
- Pacific	30,000
- Europe and North America	30,000
- Latin America and the Caribbean	45,000

---

175,000

#### XI. EXAMINATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND AND APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET FOR 1999, AND PRESENTATION OF A PROVISIONAL BUDGET FOR 2000

**XI.1** The Chairperson presented the documents related to agenda item 11:

- WHC-98/CONF.203/13, which presents the World Heritage Fund, the income and forecasts, the work plan and the proposed budget;
- WHC-98/CONF.203/13Add., which presents the approved financial statements of the World Heritage Fund as at 31 October 1998;
- WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.19, which presents the approved international assistance requests as at 15 November 1998.

Furthermore, it is recalled that the advisory bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM) had submitted their activity reports for 1997 concerning the implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.13).

Finally, the Chairperson reminded the Committee of the decisions that had been taken during this session:

- first, take note of the approved accounts of the World Heritage Fund as at 31 December 1997 and the provisional accounts for 1998 up to 31 October 1998,
- adopt the budgetary ceiling for 1999,
- allocate budgetary amounts to the different chapters according to the approved ceiling and the Committee's decisions taken during the discussions on other items of the agenda,
- examine and approve the provisional budget for 2000.

**XI.2** The Deputy Director of the Centre then presented the agenda item as follows:

- the response of the World Heritage Centre to the recommendations of the financial and administrative audit,
- the resources available for the implementation of the Convention (contributions of States Parties, Regular Programme budget, extrabudgetary funds, staff costs of the World Heritage Centre) and the state of the approved accounts of the World Heritage Fund as at 31 October 1998,
- the situation of the World Heritage Centre as at 31 October 1998,
- the budgetary proposal for 1999 and the provisional budget for 2000.

**XI.3** The Committee congratulated the Secretariat for the efforts made to improve the financial management of the World Heritage Fund. It noted the creation of a database for monitoring international assistance and preparatory action for the establishment of an integrated information management for the overall work. Members of the Committee warmly thanked Finland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America for their efforts in contributing towards the installation of this system.

**XI.4** Concerning the outstanding mandatory contributions, the Committee wished that the Secretariat contact the States Parties concerned to encourage them to pay their outstanding dues. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the outstanding dues of fifteen States Parties represented 93% of the total outstanding contributions. It also informed the Committee that, taking into consideration the new rate of calculating

UNESCO Member States' contributions<sup>1</sup>, the total mandatory contributions to be perceived would change from US\$ 2,011,116 in 1997 to US\$ 1,998,522 in 1999. Consequently, the Secretariat proposes to inform the General Assembly of States Parties and to propose a minimum amount as contribution.

**XL.5** After several questions concerning the Reserve Fund and its replenishment, the global amount of the budget was approved. This amount, taking account of the decisions taken by the Committee during its earlier sessions, amounts to **four million six hundred and seventy-six thousand United States dollars (US\$ 4, 676,000)**. The provisional budget for the year 2000 was fixed at **four million eight hundred thousand United States dollars (US\$ 4,800,000)**. The Emergency Reserve Fund approved for 1999 is **six hundred thousand United States dollars (US\$ 600,000)**.

**XL.6** The resources of the World Heritage Centre were also discussed by the Committee.

- From 1997 to 1998, the Centre experienced a reduction of two associate expert posts, whilst the contracts of three associate experts presently working at the Centre will terminate during the first six months of 1999. Consequently, the Secretariat requested the Committee to study the possibility of reinforcing the Secretariat through new associate expert posts.
- With regard to the Regular Programme budget of the Centre, on steady decrease since the past two biennium, the Committee was requested to provide its support for the next budgetary exercise (2000-2001) to assist the Centre to carry out its mission.

**XL.7** The decisions of the Committee for the chapters and components of the budget are as follows:

#### Chapter I – Implementation of the Convention

An amount of US\$ 30,000 is reserved for the organization of the extraordinary session of the Committee that will discuss the state of conservation of Kakadu National Park (Australia). This approximate amount replaces the amount deducted from the budget of Chapter V by the Committee.

The Consultative Body for the financial and management evaluation of the Centre will not receive a budgetary allocation.

The evaluation of international assistance for an amount of US\$ 40,000 of which the use is submitted for the decision of the next Bureau based on a proposal to be presented by the Secretariat, is approved.

The amount of US\$ 40,000 for the Strategic Planning Working Group was not approved.

The total approved for Chapter I amounted to US\$ 225,000

With regard to the budgetary line for attendance at statutory meetings, and following interventions concerning the use of this amount, the Secretariat proposed that the Committee study the possibility of opening this line to States Parties non-members of the Committee belonging to the group of least developed countries (LDC). No formal decision was taken on this matter by the Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the United Kingdom rejoined UNESCO, the scale used to calculate the contributions, voted by the General Conference passed from 70 to 100, reducing minimal annual contributions to the Fund to US\$ 27.

#### Chapter II – Establishment of the World Heritage List

Following discussions concerning the components of this Chapter: amounts allocated to ICOMOS and IUCN; the place of ICCROM in this Chapter and the possibility to retain a budgetary allocation for other organizations and institutions in the advisory body services (implementation level is at 60% as at 31 October 1998), the Committee approved this Chapter in its entirety.

The total amount approved for Chapter II amounted to US\$ 975,000. ICOMOS requested that one contract be established for its Global Strategy activities and advisory services.

#### Chapter III – Technical Implementation of the Convention

The amount foreseen for ICCROM for Training activities was adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Committee and reduced to US\$ 241,000.

The other budgetary lines were approved.

The total approved for Chapter III amounted to US\$ 2,626,000.

#### Chapter IV – Reactive monitoring and submission of periodic reports

This Chapter was approved without change and the total for Chapter IV therefore amounted to US\$ 465,000.

#### Chapter V – Documentation, information and education

Following the decisions of the Committee during discussions on item 15 of the agenda,

US\$ 5,000 proposed in the component “Documentation” for the application of thematic categories of properties included on the World Heritage List and the Tentative Lists was not approved.

US\$ 25,000 proposed in the component “Information material” for the application of a marketing strategy for the promotion of sales of the World Heritage Review was not approved.

The total approved for this Chapter amounted to US\$ 385,000.

The approved budget by chapter and component is provided in the following Table.

**Approved budget for 1999 and Tentative Budget for 2000 (in United States Dollars)**  
(in United States dollars)

Chapters and components	Approved Budget for 1997	Approved Budget for 1998	Approved Budget for 1999	Budget for 2000
<b>Chapter I– Implementation of the Convention</b>				
Attendance of Experts in Statutory Meetings	80 000	80 000	70 000	65 000
Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee	0	0	30 000	0
Financial, Management Reviews and Consultative Group	120 000	50 000	0	0
Development of an Information Management System	0	0	60 000	60 000
Evaluation of international assistance <sup>2</sup>	0	0	40 000	0
Co-ordination with other Conventions and Programmes, etc.	0	30 000	25 000	25 000
<b>Sub-total Chapter I</b>	<b>200 000</b>	<b>160 000</b>	<b>225 000</b>	<b>150 000</b>
<b>Chapter II– Establishment of the World Heritage List</b>				
Global Strategy	100 000	243 000	213 000	249 000
Advisory Services:				
ICOMOS	350 000	327 000	407 000	407 000
IUCN	247 000	237 750	325 000	325 000
Others	35 000	40 000	30 000	30 000
Sub-total Advisory services	632 000	604 750	762 000	762 000
<b>Sub-total Chapter II</b>	<b>732 000</b>	<b>847 750</b>	<b>975 000</b>	<b>1 011 000</b>
<b>Chapter III – Technical Implementation of the Convention</b>				
Preparatory Assistance	300 000	300 000	300 000	350 000
Technical Co-operation	900 000	1 032 500	1 245 000	1 285 000
Training	745 000	982 500	981 000	1 024 000
<i>Including ICCROM</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>p.m.</i>	<i>241 000</i>	<i>275 000</i>
<i>Including IUCN</i>	<i>n.a.</i>		<i>30 000</i>	<i>30 000</i>
<i>Including activities for the preparation of monitoring reports</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>50 000</i>	<i>50 000</i>
Support to promotional activities at sites	0	125 000	100 000	100 000
<b>Sub-total Chapter III</b>	<b>1 945 000</b>	<b>2 440 000</b>	<b>2 626 000</b>	<b>2 759 000</b>

<sup>2</sup> The use of this amount is submitted for the decision of the Bureau based on the proposal which will be presented by the Secretariat at the twenty-third session.

Chapters and components	Budget approved for 1997	Budget approved for 1998	Budget approved for 1999	Budget for 2000
<b>Chapter IV –Monitoring the state of conservation of sites</b>				
<b>Reactive monitoring</b>	80 000	120 000	195 000	195 000
<i>Including ICOMOS</i>			60 000	60 000
<i>Including IUCN</i>			45 000	50 000
<b>Periodic Reporting</b>				
Methodology development	0	25 000	15 000	0
Support to States Parties of the Region selected by the Committee (Article 29)	0	0		
*Africa	67 000	65 000	60 000	75 000
*Arab States	46 000	35 000	45 000	55 000
*Asia & Pacific	49 000	45 000	60 000	60 000
*Western Europe and North America	35 000	25 000	10 000	10 000
*Eastern & Central Europe	<i>n.a.</i>	<i>n.a.</i>	30 000	30 000
*Latin America & the Caribbean	48 000	45 000	50 000	50 000
Sub-total monitoring support	245 000	240 000	270 000	280 000
<b>Sub-total Chapter IV</b>	<b>325 000</b>	<b>360 000</b>	<b>465 000</b>	<b>475 000</b>
<b>Chapter V - Documentation, Information and Education</b>				
Documentation	55 000	38 000	35 000	40 000
Information material	132 000	165 000	155 000	180 000
• Production and distribution of an explanatory note on the implementation of Article 29	0	0	20 000	10 000
Internet & WHIN	44 000	70 000	75 000	75 000
Media & Publishers	2 000	10 000	10 000	10 000
Education	65 000	70 000	90 000	90 000
<b>Sub-total Chapter V</b>	<b>298 000</b>	<b>353 000</b>	<b>385 000</b>	<b>405 000</b>
<b>TOTAL ANNUAL BUDGET OF THE WHF</b>	<b>3 500 000</b>	<b>4 160 750</b>	<b>4 676 000</b>	<b>4 800 000</b>
Promotional activities and services for these activities	0	226 333	150 000	150 000
<b>Emergency Reserve Fund</b>	<b>500 000</b>	<b>500 000</b>	<b>600 000</b>	<b>600 000</b>
<b>III. GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>4 000 000</b>	<b>4 887 083</b>	<b>5 426 000</b>	<b>5 550 000</b>

**XI.8** The method of planning activities foreseen in the budget, particularly in Chapters II, III, IV and V, as well as the presentation of the budget, were discussed by several delegates. The Delegate of Zimbabwe requested the Committee and the Secretariat to envisage an integrated planning for international co-operation by country and site, rather than by type of activity. In his view, this approach would allow a more efficient implementation of the recommendations resulting from the different Global Strategy studies and meetings. Furthermore, this would improve the final result of the different exercises carried out with the States Parties to identify new properties and the preparation of nomination dossiers. Also, this integrated approach would ensure a better training of nationals in the implementation of the Convention.

**XI.9** With regard to the presentation of the budget, the Delegates of Finland and France proposed that improvements be made so that it may contain, in one single document, all the information presented to the Committee and that its structure be as close to that of the budget as possible.

## **XII. REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**XII.1** The Secretariat recalled the decisions taken by the Committee concerning the World Heritage Fund budget allocation for international assistance for 1999, discussed under Agenda Item 11. The Secretariat recalled the Committee's past decisions concerning the allocation of international assistance between cultural and natural heritage, requests related to the state of conservation reports on the same properties, and evaluation by the advisory bodies.

**XII.2** Taking into account these decisions, the Committee was reminded that less than US\$ 830,000 was to be allocated to technical co-operation for cultural heritage, and that less than US\$ 490,500 was to be allocated to training assistance for cultural heritage. Therefore, the Committee was informed that

should all requests for training assistance for cultural heritage recommended for approval by the Committee, Bureau and the Chairperson be approved, there would be no funds remaining for training assistance for cultural heritage in year 1999.

**XII.3** In view of the growing number of requests and amounts requested by States Parties, the Secretariat recalled paragraphs 109–112 of the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* concerning the order of priorities in granting international assistance.

**XII.4** The Secretariat presented four training assistance requests and three technical co-operation requests for natural heritage, and five training assistance requests and eight technical co-operation requests for cultural heritage to the Committee. Furthermore, requests submitted by ICCROM for three programmes (five activities) were presented. These requests, summarized in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev, were examined by the Committee in accordance with paragraphs 90–117 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Committee was invited to consult WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.12 and WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.13, in taking decisions. One emergency assistance request, received by the Secretariat after the twenty-second session of the Committee had commenced, was also presented.

**XII.5** The newly elected Bureau examined the same Working Document during a night session, and took decisions concerning international assistance requests for training and technical co-operation between US\$ 20,000 and US\$ 30,000 and emergency assistance requests up to US\$ 75,000.

**XII.6** The decisions of the Committee and the Bureau concerning these international assistance requests are summarized in the following tables.

**Synthesis table of decisions taken by the Committee and the Bureau.**

Type of assistance	Budget allocation 1999 TOTAL	Budget allocation 1999 Natural Heritage	Requests approved for Natural Heritage	Budget allocation 1999 Cultural Heritage	Requests approved for Cultural Heritage
Technical Co-operation	US\$ 1,245,000	At least US\$ 415,000	US\$ 106,000	Less than US\$ 830,000	US\$ 510,701
Training	US\$ 981,000	At least US\$ 490,500 (Including US\$ 30,000 for IUCN)	US\$ 225,028	At least US\$ 490,500 (Including US\$ 241,470 for ICCROM)	US\$ 481,370
Emergency	US\$ 600,000	N/A	US\$ 60,000	N/A	US\$ 72,448. <sup>75</sup>
TOTAL	US\$ 2,626,000		US\$ 391,028		US\$ 1,064,519. <sup>75</sup>

**Natural Heritage: Requests examined by the Committee**

<b>Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.</b>	<b>Requesting State Party</b>	<b>Type of Assistance</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount Approved (US\$)</b>	<b>Comments/ Observations/ Conditions</b>
A.2.1.1	Cameroon	Training	Three training fellowships at the School for the Training of Wildlife Specialists, Garoua, Cameroon for the Academic Biennium 1999-2001	<b>45,000</b>	
A.2.1.2	Oman	Training	Regional capacity building training workshop for the promotion of awareness in natural heritage conservation	<b>40,000</b>	The Committee requested the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a revised proposal with well-focused and clearly defined objectives, better definition of target groups, exact dates for the workshop and links to IUCN/WCPA's activities for the Arab region. The workshop programme should include a field exercise component where workshop participants would review the status of the management planning and boundary demarcation project for the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary, and prepare a report for submission to the 23 <sup>rd</sup> session of the Committee in 1999. The Committee welcomed the opportunity to link the outcome of this training activity to its concerns regarding the state of conservation of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary of Oman and called for similar linkages in training activities that may be organized in the future.
A.2.1.3	Russian Federation	Training	Lake Baikal training workshop for Russian and Trans-boundary World Natural Heritage Site-Managers and perspective Site-Managers	<b>48,528</b>	The Committee recommended that IUCN and the World Heritage Centre co-operate with the State Party in refining the structure and objectives of the training workshop. Furthermore, the Committee requested that the State Party submit a report on the results of the training activity to the 23 <sup>rd</sup> session of the Committee in 1999.
A.2.1.4	World Conservation Monitoring Centre	Training	Integrating biodiversity information management into curricula of regional wildlife/protected area management training institutions – project development workshop	<b>30,000</b>	The Committee endorsed WCMC's efforts to seek additional funding from the Darwin Initiative for the implementation of Phases 2 and 3 of the training materials and curriculum development project.
<b>Natural heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	Training		<b>163,528</b>	

Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.	Requesting State Party	Type of Assistance	Description	Amount Approved (US\$)	Comments/ Observations/ Conditions
A.2.2.1	Ecuador	Technical Co-operation	Ecological monitoring in the Galapagos Archipelago – establishing a quarantine system for monitoring the introduction and spread of alien species	<b>61,000 under Technical Co-operation</b> <b>31,500 under Training</b>	The Committee commended Ecuador for its efforts to mitigate the problem of the introduction and spread of alien species. The Committee urged the Centre and the State Party to co-operate with global initiatives, launched as a part of activities undertaken by the Convention on Biological Diversity and by international organizations such as SCOPE (Scientific Committee for the Protection of the Environment), for mitigating the introduction and spread of alien species.
A.2.2.2	IUCN-Environ-mental Law Centre	Technical Co-operation	Legal interpretation and application of the World Heritage Convention		<p>The Committee invited IUCN-ELC to circulate the proposal widely in order to obtain comments and suggestions from legal and other specialists, particularly with regard to the expected outcome of the project. The Committee requested IUCN-ELC and the Centre to co-operate to identify donors who can provide the US\$ 90,000 needed for the services of the two legal consultants (US\$ 60,000) and one research associate (US\$ 30,000), respectively. If IUCN-ELC and the Centre succeed in obtaining the US\$ 90,000 as expert costs essential for starting the project, then they may submit proposals for the organization of the meeting of the panel of experts and regional experts workshop at the appropriate time.</p> <p>The Delegate of Canada pointed out that IUCN should be requested to obtain funds needed to implement this project from sources other than the World Heritage Fund.</p> <p>The Delegate of Italy noted that the project should not deal with expected outcomes (iii) and (iv), since they involved policy prerogatives which are the responsibility of the work of the Committee.</p>
A.2.2.3	Niger	Technical Co-operation	Strengthening management at “W” National Park	<b>45,000</b>	The Committee noted that the State Party has informed the Centre that it has paid its dues to the Fund. Furthermore, the Committee requested the State Party to acknowledge receipt of equipment received and provide an inventory, to the Centre, of equipment delivered to the “W” National Park and finalize all administrative matters regarding the equipment purchase project funded by the US\$ 50,000 approved by the Committee in 1997.
<b>Natural heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Technical Co-operation</b>		<b>106,000 under Technical Co-operation</b> <b>31,500 under Training</b>	

**Natural Heritage: Requests examined by the Bureau**



Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.	Requesting State Party	Type of Assistance	Description	Amount Approved (US\$)	Comments/ Observations/ Conditions
A.1.1.1	Tanzania	Training	Support for three fellowships for African Specialists in Protected Area/Wildlife Management for the Academic Year 1999-2000 at Mweka College of African Wildlife Management, Tanzania	30,000	
<b>Natural heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Training</b>		<b>30,000</b>	

A.1.3.1	China	Emergency	Rehabilitation of Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area and Flood Damage Control	<b>60,000</b>	The Bureau commended the Chinese authorities for investing more than US\$2 million in the emergency rehabilitation of Wulingyuan. The Bureau requested the Chinese authorities to take note of the Centre/IUCN mission undertaken in September 1998 on the rehabilitation of Wulingyuan; (i) strengthening embankment and other structures essential for controlling the debris-flow is an urgent priority; (ii) the Chinese authorities may wish to review thoroughly, taking into consideration the hydrological regime of rivers, and the risks associated with frequency and severity of possible future floods and other factors, the locations and designs for the planned reconstruction of the bridges and roads with a view to making necessary changes to improve visitor management and scenic values; and (iii) the State Party may wish to undertake a thorough review of the site's tourism development policy before starting the repair and reconstruction of roads and bridges so that future locations and designs of such structures could be planned in a manner so as to improve visitor management flows. The Bureau approved the contribution of US\$60,000 requested as emergency assistance under the conditions that priority use of the funds should be for studies and analyses that may needed to complete (ii) and (iii) above. The Bureau requested the Chinese authorities to propose an itemized budget for the expenditure of US\$ 60,000 to the Centre in order to enable the Centre to establish a contract and complete other necessary administrative procedures.
<b>Natural Heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Emergency</b>		<b>60,000</b>	

**Cultural Heritage: Requests examined by the Committee**

<b>Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev.</b>	<b>Requesting State Party</b>	<b>Type of Assistance</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount Approved (US\$)</b>	<b>Comments/ Observations/ Conditions</b>
B.2.1.1	Brazil	Training	Specialized course on Integrated Territorial and Urban Conservation – Brazil programme ITUC 1999-2000	<b>49,900</b>	
B.2.1.2	China	Training	Training programme for site managers of World Heritage Cities in China – Consolidation of the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union	<b>35,000</b>	The Committee requested the State Party to strengthen the proposed programme by increasing links between ICCROM's ITUC programme and this training exercise, as proposed by ICCROM in their evaluation of the request. Furthermore, the Committee requested the State Party to give sufficient attention to follow-up after the training activity. The Observer of China expressed her Government's appreciation for the grant from the World Heritage Fund for carrying out this activity.
B.2.1.3	Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Panama	Training	Training in underwater archaeology		The Committee did not approve this request. It took note of the advisory bodies' comments: ICCROM, although supporting the initiative of the States Parties, suggested reformulation of the request to strengthen the component of conservation within the programme. ICOMOS, stating that neither the specialized ICOMOS Underwater Cultural Heritage Committee nor ICOMOS had been consulted on the formulation of this request, stressed that emphasis should be placed on conservation if this activity was to be funded under the World Heritage Fund, as part of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The Committee requested the States Parties to reformulate the request, so that the project proposed was directly relevant to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Furthermore, it encouraged the State Party to utilize the network of existing international organizations and institutions specializing in underwater heritage conservation, and to consider the possibility of extending the target audience quantitatively and geographically. The Committee took note that the United States of America had announced that, if requested, it could make available the specialized expertise for underwater heritage protection from the relevant USA authorities and the National Park Service. The Committee noted that there was a draft UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Underwater Heritage.
B.2.1.4	Lebanon	Training	Training Programme of Conservators-Restorers in the field of Mural Paintings at the World Heritage sites of Lebanon	<b>60,000</b>	The Committee requested the State Party to conduct the activity at a sub-regional level, including participants from the Syrian Arab Republic and Jordan.
B.2.1.5	Russia	Training	International training workshop for World Heritage cultural site managers from Eastern and Central Europe	<b>40,000</b>	The Committee approved US\$ 40,000, subject to the agreement by the State Party to co-operate closely with ICCROM for developing the curriculum and widening the scope of themes to be addressed, to include new modules of conservation management.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>Training</b>		<b>184,900</b>	

Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.	Requesting State Party	Type of Assistance	Description	Amount Approved (US\$)	Comments/ Observations/ Conditions
B.2.2.1	Brazil	Technical Co-operation	Restoration of the Sanctuary of Bom Jesus de Congonhas	<b>32,574</b>	
B.2.2.2	Cuba	Technical Co-operation	Rescue and preservation activities of La Estrella Fortress and of Smith (Gramma) Key at the San Pedro de la Roca Castle, Santiago de Cuba	<b>50,000</b>	
B.2.2.3	Egypt	Technical Co-operation	Rehabilitation programme for Islamic Cairo	<b>120,000</b>	<p>The Committee approved <b>US\$ 120,000</b>, stressing that this approval was an exceptional case. The Committee requested the State Party to submit a full report on the implementation of this activity after one year, for presentation to the 23<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Committee. Although fully supportive of the initiatives taken by the Egyptian authorities, a few Committee members questioned whether such a large grant should be approved, in view of the limited resources available from the World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, a member of the Committee expressed his concern, as a matter of principle, whether the Committee should commit itself to partially funding such a large project for a three-year period.</p> <p>However, the Delegate of Morocco, supported by other Committee members, stressed that Islamic Cairo was one of the most endangered World Heritage sites, and taking into consideration previous grants to Egypt for protecting its heritage sites, the Committee should continue to aid this State Party for rehabilitating Islamic Cairo. The Committee decided to approve US\$ 120,000 for the first year of the project, underlining that this was an exceptional case in view of the State Party's commitment to fund an equal amount of funds for the first year of activities, and the Committee further requested the State Party to submit a full report on the progress made in the implementation of this project to the 23<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Committee.</p> <p>The Observer of Egypt, thanking the Committee for the generous grant for the first year of activities, underlined the tremendous scale of the rehabilitation project for Islamic Cairo. He assured the Committee of his Government's commitment in implementing this hundreds of million dollar project, and stated that the technical assistance grant would represent a minimal portion within the total project budget.</p>

Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.	Requesting State Party	Type of Assistance	Description	Amount Approved (US\$)	Comments/ Observations/ Conditions
B.2.2.4	Ghana	Technical Co-operation	Documentation research for Forts and Castles of Ghana	<b>40,000</b>	The Committee approved the request, considering the importance of documenting historical data and iconographic material for enhanced management and conservation of the Forts and Castles of Ghana. However, the Committee approved the grant, subject to the following conditions : (a)Terms of Reference for the international consultant explicitly including a preliminary mission to Ghana to develop proper policies for compilation, storage, handling and conservation of the collection, and; (b)The World Heritage Centre ascertaining that there are trained staff members at Ghana Monuments and Museums Board who would be assigned to the Documentation Centre.
B.2.2.5	Peru	Technical Co-operation	Emergency measures at the Lines and Geoglyphes of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana	<b>50,000</b>	The Committee noted that the Peruvian authorities were evaluating the state of conservation of the site for possible nomination for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
B.2.2.6	Philippines	Technical Co-operation	GIS for mapping the Rice Terraces of the Philippines, and for strengthening enhanced management.	<b>50,000</b>	The Committee approved US\$ 50,000 for purchasing computer equipment and for partially funding the international expert fees. The Observer of the Philippines expressed his Government's appreciation for the generous grant approved by the Committee for producing new and adequate maps for efficient and adequate management of this site of immensely high quality cultural landscape, which is very vulnerable to a variety of adverse impacts.
B.2.2.7	Syrian Arab Republic	Technical Co-operation	Conservation Projects for the Ancient City of Damascus	<b>30,000</b>	The Committee approved of <b>US\$ 30,000</b> on the condition that the State Party submits further detailed information concerning the budget breakdown.
B.2.2.8	Turkey	Technical Co-operation	Conservation work of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia	<b>50,000</b>	The Observer of Turkey expressed his Government's appreciation for the Committee's approval for the request, although reduced. He confirmed that the restoration works were being carried out with the best of intentions, and that the national authorities had recently increased the national budget for Hagia Sophia restoration work to US\$ 700,000.
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Technical Co-op.</b>		<b>422,574</b>	

Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.	Requesting State Party	Type of Assistance	Description	Amount Approved (US\$)	Comments/Observations/Conditions
	Malta	Emergency Assistance	Urgent conservation work for Hagar Qim, Megalithic Temples	72,448. <sup>75</sup>	The Committee approved an urgent emergency assistance request submitted by Malta. The Committee took note of the evaluations of ICOMOS and ICCROM for the emergency assistance request. The Committee appreciated the urgency to address the catastrophic nature of the collapse of Hagar Qim, and considered this request could be funded from the emergency reserve. The Committee approved US\$ 72,448. <sup>75</sup> for (a) conducting a preliminary endoscopic survey; (b) reconstruction of the collapsed portion of Hagar Qim; and (c) installing an adequate monitoring system and conducting studies for preparing a long-term protection plan. The Committee requested the UNESCO Equipment Unit to assist the Maltese authorities in procuring the necessary equipment. The Maltese Delegate expressed his Government's deep appreciation for the immediate action taken by the Committee.
Cultural Heritage	Subtotal	Emergency Assistance		72,448. <sup>75</sup>	

#### ICCROM

Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.	Description	Amount Requested (US\$)	Comments/Observations/Conditions
ICCROM 1	AFRICA-2009 Conservation of immovable cultural heritage in Sub-Saharan Africa	100,000	The Committee noted that the AFRICA-2009 Programme is a joint initiative of the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and CRATerre-EAG, launched in March 1998 in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, with the endorsement of nine Sub-Saharan African States Parties.
ICCROM 2	2.1 PAT 99 – Second Pan-American Course on the Conservation and Management of Earthen Architectural and Archaeological Heritage;	78,470	
	2.2 ITUC Programme for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention – Second International ITUC Workshop	30,000	

<b>Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.20 3/14Rev.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount Requested (US\$)</b>	<b>Comments/Observations/Conditions</b>
ICCROM 3	3.1 Development of global training strategy in South East Asia	<b>25,000</b>	3.1 The Committee approved <b>US\$ 25,000</b> , requesting ICCROM to carry out a needs assessment, which would lead to the development of training curricula, which could be used (a) within university architecture and urban planning departments to teach future architects and urban planners the basics of heritage conservation; and (b) by heritage site-managers to introduce and train the inhabitants, owners, community and religious leaders, local administrators and other stakeholders of World Heritage cultural sites, on the scientific basis of heritage conservation and maintenance. The Committee recommended that ICCROM develop this strategy in South-East Asia, in close co-operation with the States Parties concerned, the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Regional Advisor for Culture in the Asia-Pacific.
	3.2 Scientific Development of the World Heritage Convention – Reference manual of methodologies for assessing the state of conservation of World Heritage sites	<b>8,000</b>	3.2 IUCN welcomed the opportunity of using this activity to enhance co-operation between the three Advisory Bodies. IUCN, reiterated the need to tightly define the target audience for the manual and that it should be aimed to support the capacity of the States Parties, as well as to enhance the process of monitoring to strengthen the management of World Heritage sites. The Committee took note that the Bureau: (1) recommended that while strongly supporting this activity, consideration for translation of the final manual into several languages should be considered from the outset; and (2) for identifying the best procedure in producing such a manual, recommended approval of an initial <b>US\$ 8,000</b> to hold a brainstorming session between the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Based upon the results of the first step, proposals could be made to the 23 <sup>rd</sup> session of the Bureau for further funding to implement the second and third phases of this activity.
ICCROM		<b>241,470</b>	

**Cultural Heritage: Requests examined by the Bureau**

<b>Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev.</b>	<b>Requesting State Party</b>	<b>Type of Assistance</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount Approved (US\$)</b>	<b>Comments/ Observations/ Conditions</b>
B.1.1.1	Argentina	Training	Support for a Master Programme in Conservation of Heritage	<b>25,000</b>	<p>The Bureau decided that US\$ 3,000 for promotional material would not be granted in view of the limited funds available. ICCROM advised that the Committee and Bureau address the issue of recurring requests for training assistance.</p> <p>ICCROM stressed that this request, as with others coming from post-graduate conservation programmes on a continuing basis, raises questions which may demand policy clarification on the Committee's part. With the number of training requests now far in excess of support funds, and with over 100 such post-graduate programmes in place in the world, it is clear that the Committee's training funds cannot be permanently committed to support operations for only a small number of these programmes. The global training strategy meeting held in Rome on 16-17 November proposes a set of criteria by which to guide future assessments of training requests. ICCROM proposes an early review of the recommendations emerging from this meeting, in order to be able to present these criteria to the Bureau meeting of June 1999. With formal consensus built around such training assistance evaluation criteria, it should be possible to ensure allocation of available funds to highest impact/highest priority programmes.</p>
B.1.1.2	Cuba	Training	Training for preventive conservation	<b>30,000</b>	<p>The Bureau decided to set aside the US\$ 30,000 under the training assistance budget, in anticipation of the submission by the Cuban authorities of a reformulated request, until the 23<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Bureau. The Cuban authorities and ICCROM agreed to cooperate to reformulate the request, following the decision of the Bureau.</p>
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Training</b>		<b>55,000</b>	

Paragraph No. as presented in WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev.	Requesting State Party	Type of Assistance	Description	Amount Approved (US\$)	Comments/ Observations/ Conditions
B.1.2.1	Bulgaria	Technical Co-operation	Technical Equipment for Monitoring Boyana Church	20,650	
B.1.2.2	Cuba	Technical Co-operation	Conservation and management of Morro-Cabana in Havana	28,777	
B.1.2.3	Kenya	Technical Co-operation	Establishment of national cultural sites database and GIS facilities		The Bureau did not approve this request. It requested the State Party to pay its dues to the World Heritage Fund, and thereafter submit a request for preparatory assistance to prepare nominations for submission to the World Heritage Committee. The Bureau requested the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to assist the State Party in preparing a preparatory assistance request, and a Tentative List.
B.1.2.4	Peru	Technical Co-operation	Protection of Chan Chan Archaeological Zone	8,700	The Bureau approved an additional US\$ 8,700 for preparing a master plan for Chan Chan Archaeological Zone site, in addition to the US\$ 20,000 approved in 1997.
B.1.2.5	Turkey	Technical Co-operation	“House of Fatih Inhabitants” within the Historic Centre of Istanbul	30,000	After the Bureau approved this request, the Observer of Turkey thanked the Bureau for making funds available from the World Heritage Fund for this project. Thanking the Secretariat for its excellent work in developing this project, the Observer of Turkey underlined that this grant would have a multiplier effect (“seed money”), to stimulate general interest in conservation, as prioritized by the Committee in paragraph 109 of the <i>Operation Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention</i> . Finally, the Observer of Turkey requested that Annex A to the Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev, be updated and attached to the report of the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee, including the statement made by Professor F. Francioni, the former Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, concerning this request. (See Annex IX)
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>Technical Co-operation</b>		<b>88,127</b>	



**XII.7** The Committee and the Bureau approved a total amount of US\$ 225,028 under training assistance, US\$ 106,000 under technical co-operation, and US\$ 60,000 under emergency assistance for natural heritage requests. With regards to cultural heritage, the Committee and Bureau approved a total amount of US\$ 481,370 for training assistance, US\$ 510,701 for technical co-operation, and US\$ 72,448.<sup>75</sup> for emergency assistance.

**XII.8** The Observer of Germany recalled that the Committee requested the Secretariat to evaluate the reports of training activities and technical co-operation financed by the World Heritage Fund. The Committee therefore reiterated its request that these evaluations be presented to the annual session of the Committee.

**XII.9** The Delegate of Japan drew the attention of the World Heritage Centre to the issue of the Pagan Site in Myanmar. At the last year's session in Naples, the Bureau requested the Centre to assist the State Party in requesting preparatory assistance. In view of the unquestionable universal significance of the site, the Delegate of Japan urged the Secretariat to encourage the State Party to submit a preparatory assistance request in the framework of the Fund's international assistance. In reply, the Director of the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that he had undertaken a mission to Pagan and invited the appropriate authorities of Myanmar to apply for emergency and/or preparatory assistance. However, no such request has yet been submitted by the Myanmar Government.

### **XIII. WORLD HERITAGE DOCUMENTATION, INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

**XIII.1** The Chairperson then turned to agenda item 13, World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities, which was detailed in Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15.

**XIII.2** The Secretariat presented an overview of the document, including its two main parts: "A Strategic Plan for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities" and "The 1999 Workplan and Budget for World Heritage Documentation, Information and Education Activities." It stated that the Working Document also includes three annexes, (1) the business case of the World Heritage Review as requested by the Bureau in June 1998, (2) the proposed radio strategy as requested by the twenty-first session of the Committee in Naples, and (3) the List of World Heritage films produced by the Centre's media partners.

**XIII.3** The Secretariat indicated that the Strategic Plan was prepared at the request of the Committee held in Naples. It stated that the work of the Consultative Body on information activities, led by Canada, and the reflection on the use of the World Heritage emblem and fund-raising led by the United States of America and Japan, gave an excellent opportunity to review pending issues.

**XIII.4** It indicated that the strategic planning exercise carried out by the Centre was based on goals and objective conditions, particularly the constraints posed by limited staff and financial resources in relation to the ever-increasing demand for a broader range of information, from general information to technical, more substantive information.

**XIII.5** Referring to Goal 5 of the 1992 Strategic Orientations, it highlighted some of the actions the Centre had undertaken since and provided the Centre's self-evaluation of the activities together with proposals of new orientations.

**XIII.6** The strategy was aimed to address two target audiences: first, the States Parties, including Permanent

Delegations to UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee and other government institutions, and second, the international community, including international and national press media, international organizations and institutions, research agencies and development cooperation agencies, the latter, aimed to influence international public opinion. As emphasized in the Working Document, the Secretariat said that the new orientation was for documentation and information activities to support each step of the world heritage conservation process, from accession, identification, nomination, inscription, periodic reporting and monitoring, and to address every objective of the Convention.

**XIII.7** It explained that the aim was to optimize use of the digitized documentation and for this electronic archive to also serve as the core source for the production of other information material for different target beneficiaries. Given the lack of human and financial resources, the Secretariat explained that the five parts of the programme were designed to complement and reinforce one another. Work to be done under Section A. Documentation, which is primarily for internal use and limited access, will serve as the base for Section B. Information, which is mainly general information targeted for States Parties, NGOs, and institutions to stimulate world heritage information activities by these entities at the national and regional levels. Section C, Internet and the World Heritage Information Network (WHIN), is the mass-targeted, multiple-use information tool, while Section D, the Self-financing Programme for Partnership with the Media and Publishers, is aimed to stimulate the production of high quality documentary films and publications by the mass media.

**XIII.8** By way of self-evaluation she said that the impact of the printed information material being produced by the Centre would be limited, due to the relatively small print-run of these products, if they are not used by the States Parties to reproduce them or use them to generate other products for national distribution. In this regard, she requested the States Parties to support the Centre's efforts to improve its mailing list, especially to ensure that the site management authorities and important national institutions receive the Centre's information. It stressed that the Centre's information products are aimed to have a multiplier effect and were used primarily to interest organizations which have their own information network. In this regard, the new orientation proposes the Centre's production of more substantive and technical information material that could serve to generate more conservation-focused information products by the partners.

**XIII.9** Referring to the marketing strategy presented by an outside consultant at the eighteenth session of the Committee in Phuket, Thailand, carried out in response to the 1992 Strategic Orientations, and to the Committee's observations at that time, some aspects were re-evaluated in the course of preparing the Strategic Plan. Particular mention was made of the need for States Parties to register the World Heritage Emblem to protect its abusive use and the Secretariat welcomed the Committee's attention to this issue by the Consultative Body. While sharing the concerns of the Committee about the commercialization of World Heritage and the merchandizing of the Emblem, it said that there were noble ways to promote World Heritage through corporate sponsorship, as demonstrated by many successful cause-oriented information campaigns. The Secretariat cited the example of the Lego company's sponsorship of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and sought the Committee's approval for the Centre to pursue such possibilities.

**XIII.10** The Secretariat also reported on the activities initiated in developing the radio strategy carried out in response to the Committee's request last year. It thanked the Delegate of Mexico for having guided the Centre to pay greater attention to this important communication medium.

**XIII.11** Section E of the Programme, the UNESCO Special Project for Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion was presented by another member of the Secretariat who recalled the major activities undertaken since the Special Project was initiated in 1994, jointly by the Centre and the Education Sector of UNESCO. The World Heritage Youth Fora, the World Heritage Education Kit, and the teacher training activities were mentioned.

**XIII.12** The Secretariat stated that the 1999 activities in the Youth Fora would include one Forum in Francophone Africa, one Forum in Latin America and the Caribbean, and the production of a World Heritage educational video. The World Heritage Education Kit would be distributed to teachers and students through UNESCO's Associated Schools Programme. The Teacher Training Programme shall include: (i) an international meeting of experts to plan the training sessions; (ii) five sub-regional training courses; (iii) support for 16 World Heritage Education National Plans of Action; (iv) consultant services; (v) equipment and (vi) advisory missions. Support from the Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD) would help support the project in 1999.

**XIII.13** The Chairperson then opened the floor for comments, recalling that there were three decisions for the Committee to adopt regarding: the Strategic Plan; Programme and Budget for 1999, and the *World Heritage Review*.

**XIII.14** The Committee commended the Secretariat for the high quality and clarity of both the written document and the presentation. Expressing appreciation for the strategic approach of the five-part programme, the Committee remarked on the wide range of activities being undertaken by the Centre in spite of limited staff and financial resources and approved the contents of the proposed Strategic Plan for Documentation, Information and Education Activities. The Special Project for Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion received wide acclaim and support from the Committee.

**XIII.15** Cautious approach was however recommended by the Delegate of Canada in soliciting corporate sponsorship for the proposed cause-oriented public information campaign, stating that this should be done only in accordance with the Guidelines on the use of the World Heritage Emblem and Fund-raising. She also stated that activity A.4 on application of thematic categories to properties on the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists was premature. Other comments included the suggestion by the Delegate of Belgium for the Secretariat to make a presentation to the General Assembly of States Parties. The Delegates of Belgium and Finland stated that there should be a better definition of the respective role of the Secretariat and the States Parties in information activities and requested an analysis in the future identifying the objectives and expected results for both the States Parties and the Centre. They indicated that local resources should be used as much as possible.

**XIII.16** The Delegate of Hungary expressed particular appreciation of the CD-ROMs on the nomination files and encouraged continued development in this area with appropriate attention paid to the format of the geographical information. He also proposed to incorporate in the future into the Strategic Plan a new World Heritage Fellowship Programme.

**XIII.17** The Delegate of the United States of America commended the dynamic and rapid response of the Secretariat in the development of the radio strategy.

**XIII.18** The Delegate of Lebanon expressed concern over the delay in the distribution of this working document and noted that it was not available on the Internet even last week.

**XIII.19** The Representative of IUCN, while indicating full support for the Strategic Plan as well as the programme, suggested that greater focus be given on success stories and closer links between the global strategy and the information strategy. He also stated the need for an information strategy vis-à-vis the tourism sector and suggested links with groups such as the Green Globe, promoting sustainable tourism. He invited the Centre's participation in high profile IUCN events such as the 2000 World IUCN Congress to be held in Jordan and 2002 World Parks Congress.

**XIII.20** The Representative of ICCROM suggested more focus on conservation in the Centre's information material, particularly in the *Review* and said that the advisory bodies can provide this input. With regard to the World Heritage Education Kit, ICCROM stated that the success of this initiative would depend upon its wide distribution in an affordable format, at little or no cost to teachers and other educators around the world. He indicated ICCROM's interest in being involved in preparing a distribution strategy of the World Heritage Education Kit.

**XIII.21** Numerous delegates echoed the concern raised by France over the sustainability of the *World Heritage Review*. Being a co-publication with UNESCO, the Committee stated that the *Review* should aim to promote the Convention and to increase awareness of the conservation needs of the sites under its protection. The *Review* as it lacks an editorial line and is no different from other travel and tourism magazines, and the need to develop its specificity was stressed. The Committee requested information on the actual sales figure rather than on the number of copies being printed and for a readership survey. Concerns were also expressed over the limited geographical reach of the *Review* as well as of the implication on staff time, especially if the periodicity is changed from a quarterly to a bimonthly. The Committee, however agreed to continue its support to ensure the quality control of the articles by approving US\$ 25,000 for co-ordination and editing fees upon noting the statement of the Centre that the articles for the *Review* will also be disseminated on the web site as the World Heritage feature article series. Support for the publicity of the *Review* was not approved by the Committee that indicated that this should be done by the commercial partner and the distributors.

**XIII.22** In responding to the comments on the *Review*, the Representative of the UNESCO Publishing Office (UPO) stated that it was in the interest of the commercial partners and distributors to publicize the *Review* and to maximize sales, hence there was no question of them trying to profit from the Committee's support. He informed the Committee that negotiations were underway for a Japanese and Korean edition of the *Review* and hoped that other language versions will follow. In response to queries concerning the expected financial break-even date, he stated that this could not be predicted and UPO hoped that the commercial partners would continue to absorb the deficit until it became self-financing.

**XIII.23** The Director of the Centre agreed with the comments of IUCN regarding the need for a more pro-active approach to promote sustainable tourism. The section of sustainable tourism introduced into the Centre's recently redesigned web site, is an attempt in that direction.

**XIII.24** The 1999 proposed activities and budget were approved for the total sum of US\$ 385,000, which takes into account the following cuts: US\$ 25,000 for co-ordination and editing fees of the World Heritage Review and US\$ 5,000 for activity A.4; application of thematic categories to properties on the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists.

#### **XIV. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

**XIV.1** The Committee examined Working Documents WHC-98/CONF.203/16 and WHC-98/CONF.203/16Add. The Committee reviewed the following proposed revisions to the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention:

##### **Section I. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST:**

**XIV.2** The Committee recalled that it had already decided under item 9 of the agenda (see Chapter IX of this report) that the Centre should work with the advisory bodies to further develop Section I of the Operational Guidelines and submit them to the twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau.

**XIV.3** The Chairperson, while referring to the earlier decision to inscribe East Rennell (Solomon Islands), proposed to include a reference to traditional protection in paragraph 44 b(vi) of the Operational Guidelines. The Delegate of Thailand stated that, in principle, the proposed amendment of the provision of the Operational Guidelines could not be applied retroactively to the case of East Rennell and expressed his reservations to this proposal. The Committee decided to revise the first sentence of this paragraph as follows:

“A site described in paragraph 44(a) should have adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional or traditional protection...”

**XIV.4** The Committee noted the proposal made by the Delegate of Italy concerning paragraph 65 and the recommendation of the Bureau at its twenty-second extraordinary session, that evaluations of nominations prepared by the advisory bodies would be also sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties which had nominated sites for inscription. The Representative of IUCN said that he saw the proposal of Italy as advantageous as it would formalize a process by which the States Parties concerned would receive copies of evaluations of properties they had nominated. While recognizing that there are merits in this proposal, the Committee noted that a more in-depth reflection was required and decided to request the Bureau at its twenty-third session to examine this proposal in the context of the overall revision of Section I.

##### **Section II. REACTIVE MONITORING AND PERIOD REPORTING:**

**XIV.5** The Committee recalled that it had already amended and adopted the proposed revisions to this Section under item 6 of the agenda (see Chapter VI of this report).

**XIV.6** During the discussions on the revision of the Operational Guidelines, the Committee considered a proposal by the Delegate of Hungary, an additional item h to Section II.1.: Appropriate Geographical Information, together with the following text to be included in the Explanatory Notes:

“If appropriate geographical information is not available or incomplete, it will be necessary, in the first periodic report for the State Party to provide such information. Such geographical information should be provided in an appropriate form to assist the Centre to create and maintain a user-friendly Geographical Information System of the World Heritage properties for easy reference by the States Parties and other interested partners.”

The Committee decided that this proposal needs further reflection and discussion at the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

#### **Section IV. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**XIV.7** The Secretariat informed the Committee that it withdrew proposed revisions to paragraphs 92 to 106 as included in Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/16.

**XIV.8** As to the budgetary ceiling for Preparatory Assistance, the Committee decided to raise the ceiling to US\$ 30,000 with the understanding that the Chairperson would be authorized to approve requests up to an amount of US\$ 20,000, whereas the Bureau's approval would be required for amounts between US\$ 20,000 and US\$30,000. The last sentence of paragraph 90 was amended as follows:

“This type of assistance known as “preparatory assistance”, can take the form of consultant services, equipment or, in exceptional cases, financial grants. The budgetary ceiling for each preparatory assistance project is fixed at US\$30,000. The Chairperson has the authorization to approve preparatory assistance requests up to an amount of US\$ 20,000, whereas the Bureau can approve requests up to an amount of US\$30,000.”

**XIV.9** The Committee decided to include in paragraph 107 a reference to education and information activities as follows:

“(v) Assistance for education, information and promotional activities

107. (a) at the regional and international levels:

With reference to Article 27 of the Convention, the Committee has agreed to support programmes, activities and the holding of meetings that could:

- help to create interest in the Convention within the countries of a given region;
- create a greater awareness of the different issues related to the implementation of the Convention to promote more active involvement in its application;
- be a means of exchanging experiences;
- stimulate joint education, information and promotional programmes and activities, especially when they involve the participation of young people for the benefit of World Heritage conservation.

(b) at the national level:

The Committee felt that requests concerning national activities for promoting the Convention could be considered only when they concern:

meetings specifically organized to make the Convention better known, especially amongst young

people, or for the creation of national World Heritage associations, in accordance with Article 17 of the Convention;

preparation of education and information material for the general promotion of the Convention and not for the promotion of a particular site, and especially for young people.

The World Heritage Fund shall provide only small contributions towards national education, information and promotional programmes and activities on a selective basis and for a maximum amount of \$5,000. However, requests for sums above this amount could exceptionally be approved for projects that are of special interest: the Chairperson's agreement would be required and the maximum amount approved would be \$10,000."

## **Section V. WORLD HERITAGE FUND**

**XIV.10** Following discussions under agenda item 9 on Fund-Raising Guidelines, the Committee decided to add the following paragraph to this Section of the Operational Guidelines:

"121. The Secretariat should refer to the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO" to govern external fund-raising in favour of the World Heritage Fund."

The paragraphs following 121 will be renumbered in consequence.

## **Section VII. OTHER MATTERS**

**XIV.11** The Committee recalled that it had discussed the issue on the use of the World Heritage Emblem under agenda item 9. It decided to delete paragraphs 124 to 128 from the Operational Guidelines and to amend paragraphs 122 and 123 as follows:

"A. Use of the World Heritage Emblem and the name, symbol or depiction of World Heritage sites

122. At its second session, the Committee adopted the World Heritage Emblem which had been designed by Mr. Michel Olyff. This Emblem symbolizes the interdependence of cultural and natural properties: the central square is a form created by man and the circle represents nature, the two being intimately linked. The Emblem is round, like the world, but at the same time it is a symbol of protection. The Committee decided that the Emblem proposed by the artist (see Annex 2) could be used, in any colour or size, depending on the use, the technical possibilities and considerations of an artistic nature. The Emblem should always carry the text "World Heritage. Patrimoine Mondial". The space occupied by "Patrimonio Mundial" can be used for its translation into the national language of the country where the Emblem is to be used.

123. In order to ensure the Emblem benefits from as much visibility as possible while preventing improper uses, the Committee at its twenty-second session adopted "Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the World Heritage Emblem" which shall be considered an integral part of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and are attached as Annex 3."

The paragraphs following 123 will be renumbered in consequence.

## **XV. DATE, PLACE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE BUREAU OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XV.1** The Chairperson opened the discussion on this agenda item by noting that during the year there would be six meetings of the statutory bodies, as follows:

- the twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau;
- the first twenty-third extraordinary session of the Committee on Kakadu National Park (Australia);
- the twelfth General Assembly of the States Parties at the time of the 30<sup>th</sup> session of UNESCO's General Conference;
- the second extraordinary session of the Committee following the General Assembly of the States Parties;
- the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau; and
- the twenty-third ordinary session of the Committee

**XV.2** The Chairperson introduced Working Document WHC-98/CONF.203/17. When adopting the report, the Committee decided that the twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau would be held from 5 to 10 July 1999. The Committee adopted the provisional agenda for this session of the Bureau, attached as Annex X.

**XV.3** The Committee decided that the twenty-third extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee concerning Kakadu National Park (Australia) would be held on 12 July 1999.

## **XVI. DATE AND PLACE OF THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**XVI.1** The Chairperson recalled that during the twenty-first session in Naples, Italy, Morocco had presented its candidature to host the twenty-third ordinary session of the Committee. The Delegate of Morocco informed the Committee that H.M. Government of Morocco would be pleased to host the next session in Marrakesh. The Committee thanked the Kingdom of Morocco for this generous invitation which it accepted. The twenty-third ordinary session of the Committee will be held in Marrakesh from 29 November to 4 December 1999. It will be preceded by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau, on 26 and 27 November 1999. The Delegate of Morocco then thanked the Committee for its decision.

**XVI.2** The Delegate of Australia recalled that her Government had already informed the Committee of its wish to host the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in Australia.

**XVI.3** The Delegate of Finland recalled that his Government had expressed the wish to host the session of the Committee in 2001.

## **XVII. OTHER BUSINESS**

**XVII.1** The Delegate of Hungary introduced three statements that are attached in Annex XI which concern:

- (a) an invitation to the Committee to hold one of its regular sessions in Budapest at an appropriate time within the span of Hungary's membership in the Committee;
- (b) appropriate geographical information system and remarks on Document WHC-98/CONF.203/15 pertaining to networking and geographical information; and
- (c) a proposal to launch a World Heritage Fellowship Programme.

**XVII.2** The Committee took note of these statements. The Delegate of Australia indicated that her Government would contact the Hungarian Delegation in due course in order to reach an agreement.

**XVII.3** Prof. Francioni (Italy), the Chairperson of the Committee during 1997-1998, presented on behalf of the Committee, a copy of the Convention's text, signed by all the members of the Committee, to Mr. Bernd von Droste, Director of the World Heritage Centre, in acknowledgement of the work he had accomplished.

## **XVIII, CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

**XVIII.1** The Chairperson expressed his thanks to all delegations, members of the advisory bodies, observers, members of the Secretariat and the interpretation team, for their patience and hard work. He extended special thanks to Mr von Droste and the Rapporteur.

**XVIII.2** The Delegates of Morocco and Benin thanked the Government of Japan and the people of Kyoto for their warm welcome. They also thanked the staff of the Kyoto International Conference Hall, and the Chairperson for his kindness and affability, which permitted the Committee to reach fair decisions and a consensus during long and difficult discussions. Furthermore, the Delegate of Morocco stated that he would do all in his power to merit the confidence accorded to his Government by the Committee.

**XVIII.3** The Chairperson declared the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE  
COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL**

**Twenty-Second session / Vingt-deuxième session**

**Kyoto, Japan / Kyoto, Japon**

**30 November - 5 December 1998 / 30 novembre – 5 décembre 1998**

---

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS**

---

**I. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE / ETATS MEMBRES DU COMITE**

<b>AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE</b>
----------------------------

Mr Roger BEALE  
Secretary  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
GPO BOX 1567  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Mr Peter SHANNON  
Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO  
Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Ms Sharon M. SULLIVAN  
Head  
Australian and World Heritage Group  
Department of the Environment and Heritage  
GPO BOX 1567  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dr Arthur JOHNSTON  
First Assistant Secretary  
Environment Australia  
PMB 2  
JABIRU NT

Mr Peter Eric VAUGHAN  
First Assistant Secretary  
Office of Indigenous Affairs  
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet  
3-5 National Circuit  
BARTON ACT 2600

Mr Kevin KEEFE  
Assistant Secretary  
World Heritage Branch  
Environment Australia  
IBM House  
8 Brisbane Avenue  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Mr Robin BRYANT  
General Management  
Department of Industry, Science and Resources  
GPO Box 9839  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Mr Jon DAY  
Director Conservation, Biodiversity and World Heritage  
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority  
PO BOX 1379  
TOWNSVILLE, Queensland

Ms Jadranka MCALPINE  
Assistant Director  
World Heritage Unit  
Environment Australia  
IBM House  
8 Brisbane Avenue  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Mr David WALKER  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Australia to UNESCO  
Permanent Delegation of Australia to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr Brad STEWART  
Third Secretary  
Australian Embassy in Japan  
2-1-4 Mita, Minato-ku  
TOKYO

#### **BENIN**

M. Isidore MONSI  
Premier Conseiller  
Délégation permanente du Bénin auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

M. Jules BOCCO  
Directeur du patrimoine culturel  
Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication  
BP 120  
COTONOU

#### **BRAZIL/BRESIL**

Mr Genesio SILVEIRA DA COSTA  
Counsellor  
Embassy of Brazil  
2-11-12, Kita Aoyama  
Minato-ku  
TOKYO 107-8633

#### **CANADA**

Dr Christina CAMERON  
Director General  
National Historic Sites  
Parks Canada  
Department of Canadian Heritage  
25 Eddy Str.  
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5

Mr Murray McCOMB  
Manager, Special projects  
National Parks Directorate  
Parks Canada  
Department of Canadian Heritage  
25 Eddy Str.  
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5

Mme Gisèle CANTIN  
Affaires internationales  
Parcs Canada  
Ministère du Patrimoine Canadien  
25 rue Eddy  
HULL Québec, KIA OM 5

#### **CUBA**

Ms Marta ARJONA  
Presidenta Consejo Nacional del Patrimonio Cultural  
Ministerio de la Cultura  
Calle 4 y 13, Vedado  
LA HABANA

Lic. Maria Josefa VILABOY MORALES  
Jefa de Asuntos Multilaterales del Ministerio de la Cultura  
Ministerio de la Cultura  
Calle 4 el 11 y 13, Vedado  
LA HABANA

#### **ECUADOR/EQUATEUR**

M. Hernán GUARDERAS  
Directeur national  
Institut national du patrimoine culturel de l'Equateur (INPC)  
Av. Colon 1234  
QUITO

Mr Fabian SANDOVAL  
Advisor to the Minister of Environment  
Ministry of the Environment  
P.O. Box 17-12-486  
QUITO

#### **FINLAND/FINLANDE**

Mr Henrik LILIUS  
Director General  
National Board of Antiquities  
BOX 13  
HELSINKI 00100

Ms Anne LAMMILA  
Deputy Permanent Delegate of Finland to UNESCO  
Permanent Delegation of Finland to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

#### **FRANCE**

S. Exc. M. Jean MUSITELLI  
Ambassadeur  
Délégué permanent  
Délégation permanente de la France auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

M. Michel JANTZEN  
Architecte  
Ministère de la Culture  
3, rue de Valois  
75001 PARIS

M. Alain MEGRET  
Directeur adjoint de la Nature et des Paysages  
Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de  
l'Environnement  
20, avenue de Ségur  
75302 PARIS Cedex 07

M. Chérif KHAZNADAR  
Président du Comité Culture  
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
36, rue La Pérouse  
75775 PARIS Cedex 16

Mme Eva CAILLART  
Chargée de mission à la Direction de l'architecture et du  
patrimoine (DAPA)  
Ministère de la Culture  
3, rue de Valois  
75001 PARIS

Mme Catherine DUMESNIL  
Conseiller technique  
Commission nationale française pour l'UNESCO  
36, rue La Pérouse  
75775 PARIS Cedex 16

#### **GREECE/GRECE**

Mme Hélène METHODIOU  
Conseiller pour la Culture  
Délégation permanente de la Grèce auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mme Anastasia PAPADOPOULOU  
Archéologue  
Ministère de la Culture  
23, Bouboulinas Str.  
10186 ATHENES

M. Dimitrios KONSTANTIOS  
Archéologue  
Ministère de la Culture  
23, Bouboulinas Str.  
10186 ATHENES

#### **HUNGARY/HONGRIE**

Mr Zoltan SZILASSY  
Deputy Head of Department  
Ministry for Environment  
1121 Kolto u.21  
BUDAPEST

M. Janos Ferenc NEMETH  
Director General  
Department of Monuments  
Ministry of Cultural Heritage  
Szalai Utca 10-14  
H-1055 BUDAPEST

M. Janos JELEN  
Ambassadeur  
Conseiller à la Commission nationale hongroise pour  
l'UNESCO  
Ministère des Affaires étrangères  
Magyar UNESCO Bizottsag Titkarsaga  
Szalay u. 10 - 14  
H – 1055 BUDAPEST

#### **ITALY/ITALIE**

H.E. Mr Giovanni DOMINEDO  
Italian Ambassador to Japan  
Italian Embassy  
TOKYO

H. E. Mr Gabriele SARDO  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate of Italy to UNESCO  
Permanent Delegation of Italy to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr Francesco FRANCIONI  
Professeur  
Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Sienne  
Piazza San Francesco  
53100 SIENA

Mme Lucia FIORI  
Conseiller, Chef du Bureau pour la coopération culturelle  
multilatérale  
Direction générale des relations culturelles  
Ministère des Affaires étrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina  
00194 ROME

Mme Margherita SABATINI  
Responsable du Secteur UNESCO au Bureau pour la  
coopération culturelle multilatérale  
Ministère des Affaires Etrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina  
00194 ROME



Mr Pasquale Bruno MALARA  
Expert, Surintendant au Patrimoine architectural de la  
Région de Turin  
Ministère des Biens et des Activités culturelles  
Piazza S. Giovanni, 2  
10122 TURIN

Mme Roberta ALBEROTANZA  
Responsable UNESCO au Cabinet du Ministre des Biens  
et Activités culturelles  
Via del Collegio Romano, 27  
00186 ROME

M. Luciano MARCHETTI  
Ingénieur  
Surintendance pour les Biens culturels de Florence  
Ministère des Biens et des Activités culturelles  
Piazza Pitti 1  
FLORENCE

Mr Fumiko NAKAMURA  
Secretary  
Italian Cultural Institute  
4 Yoshida Ushinomiya, Sakyo-ku  
KYOTO

#### **JAPAN/JAPON**

H.E. Mr Koichiro MATSUURA  
President of the World Heritage Committee  
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Japan  
to France  
Embassy of Japan in France  
7, avenue Hoche  
75008 PARIS

Mr Yasukuni ENOKI  
Director-General  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,  
TOKYO, 100-8919

Mr Takahito NARUMIYA  
Counsellor  
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr Yuichi ISHII  
Director  
Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-8919

Mr Takahiro OKAMOTO  
Official  
Multilateral Cultural Cooperation Division  
Cultural Affairs Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-8919

M. Tomoyuki ONO  
Troisième Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente du Japon auprès de l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr Atsuhiko YOSHINAKA  
Assistant Director  
Planning Division  
Nature Conservation Bureau  
Environment Agency  
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100-8975

Mr Hideki HAYASHIDA  
Commissioner  
Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkacho)  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-0013

Mr Akitoshi INOUE  
Director-General  
Cultural Properties Protection Department  
Agency for Cultural Affairs(Bunkacho)  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-0013

Mr Hiroshi SOWAKI  
Director  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department,  
Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkacho)  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-0013

Dr Makoto MOTONAKA  
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Monuments and Sites Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department,  
Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkacho)  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-0013

Dr Kanefusa MASUDA  
Chief Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Architecture Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department,  
Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkacho)  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-0013

Dr Nobuko INABA  
Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties  
Architecture Division  
Cultural Properties Protection Department,  
Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkacho)  
3-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-0013

Mr Migaku TANAKA  
Director-General  
Nara National Cultural Properties Research Institute  
2-9-1, Nijocho  
NARA, 630-8002

Mr Muneo SEGAWA  
Senior Auditor  
General Affairs Division  
National Forest General Affairs Department  
Forestry Agency  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO, 100-8952

Mr Takashi UEDA  
Planning Director  
Science and International Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture  
TOKYO

Mr Kazuo FUJII  
Official  
Planning Division  
Nature Conservation Bureau  
Environment Agency  
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100-8975

Ms Kumiko YONEDA  
Research Staff  
Japan Wildlife Research Centre  
2-29-3 Yushima, Bunkyo-ku  
TOKYO, 113-0034

#### **LEBANON/LIBAN**

M. Camille ASMAR  
Directeur général des Antiquités  
Musée national  
BEYROUTH

M. Noël FATTAL  
Délégué permanent adjoint du Liban auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

M. Roger SAYYAH  
Ingénieur  
Ministère de l'Environnement  
P.O. Box 70-1091  
ANTELIAS

#### **MALTA/MALTE**

M. Reuben GRIMA  
Curator, Site Management Unit  
National Museum of Archaeology  
Republic Street  
VALLETTA CMR 02

#### **MEXICO/MEXIQUE**

Mr Francisco J. LOPEZ MORALES  
Deputy Director, Historic Monuments  
National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH)  
Correo Mayor 11, Centro Historico  
MEXICO DF

Mr Oscar RAMIREZ FLORES  
Director-General,  
SEMARNAP-Mexico  
Pitagoras # 1320  
Col. Sta. Cruz Atoyac  
03310 MEXICO DF

Ms Sandra Patricia PINA SALINAS  
Trade Ministry  
Alfonso Reyes, 1<sup>er</sup> Piso  
MEXICO DF

#### **MOROCCO/MAROC**

M. Abdelaziz TOURI  
Directeur,  
Direction du Patrimoine culturel  
Ministère des Affaires Culturelles  
17, rue Michlifén, Agdal  
RABAT

M. Ahmed SKOUNTI  
Chargé de recherche  
Direction du patrimoine culturel  
Ministère des Affaires culturelles  
17, rue Michlifén, Agdal,  
RABAT

**NIGER**

M. André ZODI  
Secrétaire général  
Ministère de la Culture  
BP 215  
NIAMEY

M. Seyni SEYDOU  
Directeur de la Faune, de la Pêche et de la Pisciculture  
Ministère de l'Hydraulique et de l'Environnement  
B.P. 721  
NIAMEY

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA/REPUBLIQUE DE COREE**

H.E. Mr YANG Dong-chil  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea to  
UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr CHO Hyun-jae  
Director  
Intangible Cultural Property Division  
Office of Cultural Properties  
Government Complex Taejeon  
SEOUL

Mr YOO Euy-sang  
First Secretary  
Embassy of the Republic of Korea in Japan  
1-2-5 Minami Azabu, Minato-ku  
TOKYO, 106

Mr HUH Kwon  
Director of Culture and Communication  
Korean National Commission for UNESCO  
C.P.O. Box 64  
SEOUL, 100-600

Mr JANG Ho-su  
Special Commissioner  
The Cultural Properties Commission  
Office of Cultural Properties  
SEOUL

**THAILAND/THAILANDE**

Prof. Dr Adul WICHIENTHAROEN  
Chairman  
National Committee on the Protection of the World  
Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Rama 6 Road  
10400 BANGKOK

Mr Manit SIRIWAN  
Director  
National Committee on the Protection of the World  
Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Rama 6 Road  
10400 BANGKOK

Mr Watana KAEOKAMNERD  
Deputy Director General of Royal Forest Department  
Royal Forest Department MOAC  
R.F.D. BANGKOK 10900

Mrs Siripom NANTA  
National Committee on the Protection of the World  
Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Rama 6 Road  
10400 BANGKOK

Mr Chumphon SUKASEAM  
Superintendent of Phu-Hin Ranglo  
Royal Forest Department  
National Park Division  
BANGKOK

Mrs Weeranut MAITHAI  
Specialist in Art Education  
Fine Arts Department  
Ministry of Education  
BANGKOK 10200

Ms Chirawan PIPITPHOKA  
Deputy Secretariat,  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Rama 6 Road  
10400 BANGKOK

Mr Payung NOPSUWAN  
National Committee on the Protection of the World  
Heritage  
Office of Environmental Policy and Planning  
60/1 Rama 6 Road  
10400 BANGKOK

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/ETATS-UNIS  
D'AMERIQUE**

Ms Karen T. KOVACS  
Counselor to the Assistant Secretary  
Fish and Wildlife and Parks  
United States Department of the Interior  
1849 C ST. N.W. WASHINGTON DC 20240

Mr John J. REYNOLDS  
Regional Director, Pacific West Region  
National Park Service  
Department of Interior  
600 Harrison St., suite 600  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94107

Mr William W. McILHENNY  
Permanent Observer of the United States to UNESCO  
American Embassy  
2, avenue Gabriel  
75008 PARIS

Mr James H. CHARLETON  
International Cooperation Specialist  
Office of International Affairs  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C. ST., NW  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

**ZIMBABWE**

Mr Dawson MUNJERI  
Executive Director  
The National Museums and Monuments  
P.O.Box CY 1485, Causeway  
HARARE

Mr Albert KUMIRAI  
Regional Director  
National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe  
Natural History Museum of Zimbabwe  
P.O. Box 240  
BULAWAYO

**II. ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING IN ADVISORY CAPACITY/  
ORGANISATIONS PARTICIPANT A TITRE CONSULTATIF**

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION AND THE RESTORATION OF  
CULTURAL PROPERTY (ICCROM) / CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ETUDES POUR LA CONSERVATION  
ET LA RESTAURATION DES BIENS CULTURELS (ICCROM)**

Mr Marc LAENEN  
Director-General  
via di San Michele, 13  
00153 Rome  
Italy

Mr Joseph KING  
Program Officer  
via di San Michele, 13  
00153 ROME  
Italy

Mr Herb STOVEL  
World Heritage Convention Coordinator  
via di San Michele, 13  
00153 ROME  
Italy

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES (ICOMOS) / CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES  
MONUMENTS ET DES SITES (ICOMOS)**

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN  
Secrétaire général  
49-51, rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

Mme Carmen ANON  
Membre du Comité Exécutif de l'ICOMOS  
Puerto Santa Maria 49  
MADRID 28043

Dr Henry CLEERE  
Coordinateur du Patrimoine Mondial  
49-51, rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

Mme Regina DURIGHELLO  
Assistante du Coordinateur  
49-51, rue de la Fédération  
75015 PARIS

M. Akira ISHII  
Président du Comité national japonais de l'ICOMOS  
6-18-9 Kamiyoga, Setagaya-ku  
TOKYO 158-0098

M. Yukio NISHIMURA  
Comité national japonais de l'ICOMOS  
2-4-7 Shibdeb-Ichikawa  
CHIBA 272-0035

<b>THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN) / UNION MONDIALE POUR LA NATURE (UICN)</b>
---

Patrick J. DUGAN  
Director, Global Programmes  
IUCN Headquarters  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH- 1196 GLAND, Switzerland

Mr P.H.C. (Bing) LUCAS  
Vice-Chair World Heritage  
World Commission for Protected Areas  
1/268 Main Road, Tawa  
WELLINGTON 6006, New Zealand

Mr David SHEPPARD  
Head, Programme on Protected Areas  
IUCN Headquarters  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH- 1196 GLAND, Switzerland

Ms Pam EISER  
Executive Officer  
Australian Committee for IUCN  
Level 1, York Street  
P.O. Box 528  
SYDNEY, NSW 2001, Australia

Dr Jim THORSELL  
Senior Advisor  
c/o IUCN Headquarters  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH- 1196 GLAND, Switzerland

Mr Sasha SAITA  
Volunteer  
c/o IUCN Headquarters  
rue Mauverney, 28  
CH- 1196 GLAND, Switzerland

### **III. OBSERVERS/OBSERVATEURS**

#### **(i) STATES PARTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION**

<b>AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE</b>
-------------------------

M. Hans HORCICKA  
Director, Deputy Head of Dpt. IV/3, Protection of  
Monuments  
Federal Ministry for Education and Cultural Affairs  
Schreyvogelgasse 2/304  
A-1010 VIENNA

M. André MATTHYS  
Inspecteur général  
Direction générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire, du  
Logement et du Patrimoine  
Division du patrimoine  
Ministère de la Région Wallone  
1, rue des Brigades d'Irlande  
5100 NAMUR/JAMBES

<b>BELGIUM/BELGIQUE</b>
-------------------------

M. Edgard GOEDLEVEN  
Chef de la Division des Monuments et des Sites  
Administration de l'Aménagement du Territoire, du  
Logement et des Monuments et Sites  
Ministère de la Communauté Flamande  
Bâtiment Graaf de Ferraris,  
Emile Jacqmainlaan 156, boîte 7  
1000 BRUXELLES

Mme Bénédicte SELFSLAGH  
Conseiller, Relations internationales  
Direction générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire, du  
Logement et du Patrimoine  
Division du Patrimoine  
Ministère de la Région Wallone  
c/o 12-14 rue d'Aumale,  
F-75009 PARIS

M. Christian SPAPENS  
Architecte Directeur  
Ministère de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale  
Chaussée d'Alseberg, 647  
1180 BRUXELLES

Mme Marie-Dominique VAN HAMME  
Chargée de mission  
Cabinet du Ministre-Président de la Région de Bruxelles-  
Capitale  
Rue Ducale 7-9  
B 1000 BRUXELLES

#### **CAMEROON/CAMEROUN**

Mr André-Marie ATANGANA-ZANG  
Minister Plenipotentiary  
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.  
Embassy of the Republic of Cameroon  
3-27-16 Nozawa, Setagaya-ku  
TOKYO 154-0003

#### **CHINA/CHINE**

Mr Guo ZHAN  
Secretary General of ICOMOS China  
29, Wusi street  
BEIJING 100009

Mr Liutong GENG  
Deputy Chief Engineer  
Beijing Municipal Bureau of Gardens and Parks  
Summer Palace  
BEIJING

Mr Qing Sheng ZHOU  
Engineer  
Beijing Municipal Bureau of Gardens and Parks  
BEIJING

Ms Yu XIAOPING  
Program Officer  
Chinese National Commission for UNESCO  
37, Damucanghutong  
BEIJING

#### **CYPRUS/CHYPRE**

Dr Sopholes HADJISAVVAS  
Director  
Department of Antiquities  
Ministry of Communications and Works  
Museum Street 1  
NICOSIA

#### **CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE**

Dr Josef STULC  
Director of the State Institute for Heritage Preservation  
Statni ustav památkové péče  
Valdstejske 3  
11001 PRAGUE 1

#### **EGYPT/EGYPTE**

H.E. Prof. Fathi SALEH  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate of Egypt to UNESCO  
Permanent Delegation of Egypt to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

#### **ESTONIA/ESTONIE**

Mr Jaan TAMM  
Director-General  
Estonian Central Board of Antiquities  
18, Uus Street  
EE 0001 TALLIN

#### **FIJI/FIDJI**

Mr Nemani BURESOVA  
Permanent Secretary  
Ministry for Women & Culture  
GPO Bag 14068  
SUVA

#### **GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE**

Mr Uwe PETRY  
First Secretary  
Foreign Office  
P.O.B. 1148  
53001 BONN

M. Hans CASPARY  
Conservateur du Service des Monuments Historiques  
Schillerstr. 44  
55116 MAINZ

**GHANA**

Mr Nana Akuoko SARPONG  
Presidential Staffer for Chieftaincy Affairs and Chairman  
of National Commission on Culture  
1, Gamal Abdul Nasser Avenue  
Private Mail Bag  
Ministry Post Office  
ACCRA

**GUATEMALA**

Dr Carlos Enrique ZEA FLORES  
Vice-Minister of Culture and Sports  
5a Calle 5-43 zona 1  
GUATEMALA CITY 01001

**HOLY SEE/SAINT-SIEGE**

Mgr Francisco PADILLA  
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.  
Apostolic Nunciature  
Vatican Embassy  
9-2 Sanban-cho, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO

Mgr Tullio POLI  
Officer  
Secretariat of State, Section for relations with States  
Casa S. Marta  
I-00120 VATICAN City

Révérénd Thomas Aquinas Yojiro TOMON  
Expert  
Parish Priest in Kyoto  
KYOTO

**INDONESIA/INDONESIE**

Mr Winnetou NOWAWI  
Education and Cultural Attaché  
Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia  
2-9 Higashi Gotanda 5 Chome  
TOKYO

**LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC/  
REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE  
POPULAIRE LAO**

Mr Siskhanxay PHAKHANXAY  
Architect  
Ministry of Information and Culture  
Sathathirat Road  
P.O. Box 122  
VIENTIANE

**LITHUANIA/LITUANIE**

S. Exc. Mme Ugnė KARVELIS  
Ambassadeur  
Délégue permanente de la Lituanie auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
Délégation permanente de la Lituanie auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mrs Audronė KASPERAVICIENE  
President of ICOMOS, Lithuania  
Senior Historian of Architecture of Vilnius Old Town  
Renewal Agency  
Miglos 5 s-45  
VILNIUS 2034

**NEPAL**

H.E. Mr Kedar B. MATHEMA  
Ambassador of Nepal to Japan  
Royal Nepalese Embassy  
14-9 Todoroki, 7-Chome, Setagaya-ku  
TOKYO 158

Ms Riddhi PRADHAN  
Director General  
Department of Archaeology  
Ram Shah Path  
KATHMANDU

**NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS**

Dr Robert DE JONG  
Senior Staff Member/Coordinator for World Heritage  
Netherlands State Department for Conservation  
Broederplein 41  
3703 CD ZEIST

Mr Fred F.J. SCHOORL  
Head of Immovable Heritage  
Ministry of Education, Culture and Science  
P.B. 25000  
2700 LZ ZOETERMEER

**NEW ZEALAND/ NOUVELLE ZELANDE**

Mr Michael SLATER  
Conservator  
West Coast Conservancy  
Department of Conservation  
Private Bag 701  
HOKITIKA

**NORWAY/NORVEGE**

Mrs Anne-Kristin ENDRESEN  
Director  
Nordic World Heritage Office  
Dronningsgt. 13  
Postboks 8013  
OSLO Department

Mr Einar HOLTANE  
Deputy Director General  
Ministry of Environment  
Section for Cultural Heritage  
Department for Nature Conservation and Cultural  
Heritage  
Myntgata 2  
P.O. Box 8013 Dep.  
N-0030 OSLO

**PERU/PEROU**

Mr Alberto FARJE  
Diplomat  
Embassy of Peru  
4-4-27, Higashi, Shibaya-ku  
TOKYO

**PHILIPPINES**

H.E. Mr Hector K. VILLARROEL  
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the  
Philippines to France  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of the Philippines to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Architect. Augusto F. VILLALON  
Commissioner, Committee on Culture  
UNESCO National Commission of the Philippines  
Department of Foreign Affairs Building  
2330, Roxas Boulevard, Pasay City  
Metro MANILLA

Mme Deanna ONGPIN-RECTO  
Premier Secrétaire  
Délégation permanente des Philippines auprès de  
l'UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

**POLAND/POLOGNE**

Prof. Andrzej TOMASZEWSKI  
Directeur général du patrimoine  
Ministère de la Culture  
Ksamerov 13  
00656 WARSZAWA

Mme Aleksandra WACLAWCZYK  
Secrétaire général adjoint  
Commission nationale polonaise pour l'UNESCO  
Palac Kultury: Nauki 7p  
00901 WARSZAW

**PORTUGAL**

H.E. Mr Jorge RITTO  
Ambassador  
Permanent Delegate  
Permanent Delegation of Portugal to UNESCO  
1, rue Miollis  
75732 PARIS Cedex 15

Mr Eduardo de CARVALHO  
Cultural Counsellor  
Embassy of Portugal  
Kojihunchi  
TOKYO

M. Joao ZILHAO  
Directeur  
Institut portugais d'Archéologie  
Av. India, 136  
P-1300 LISBONNE

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE  
RUSSIE**

Mr Vladimir PISHCHELEV  
Deputy Director  
Department of Protected Areas Management  
State Committee on Environment of the Russian  
Federation  
Parusny proezd 13-2  
123364 MOSCOW

Mr Anatoly EFIMENKO  
Chairman  
State Committee on Environment of the Kamtchaka  
Region  
29/1 Karl Marx Avenue  
683031 PETROPAVLOVSKY-KAMCHATSKY



Mr Alexei BOUTORINE  
Nature expert  
Geographical Research Institute  
Academy of Science  
Member of the Russian Committee on World Heritage  
Viborskaya 8 –3  
MOSCOW 125212

Ms A. MAKSIMOVA  
Senior Expert  
State Committee for Environmental Protection  
MOSCOW

#### **SAUDI ARABIA/ARABIE SAOUDITE**

Dr Abdullah SAUD AL SAUD  
Ministry of Education  
Dep. Min. of Antiquities  
P.O. Box 3734  
11481 RIYAD

#### **SLOVAKIA/SLOVAQUIE**

Mr Jozef KLINDA  
Director General  
Ministry of the Environment  
Namestie L. Stura 1  
812 35 BRATISLAVA

Mr Kamil VILINOVIC  
Specialist  
Ministry of the Environment  
Namestie L Stura 1  
812 35 BRATISLAVA

Mr Jozef HLAVAC  
Specialist  
Slovak Show Caves Administration  
HODJOVA – 11  
MIKULAS

#### **SOLOMON ISLANDS/ILES SALOMON**

Mr Ben N. DEVI  
Deputy Director of Tourism  
Ministry of Commerce and Tourism  
Tourism Division  
P.O. Box G26  
HONIARA

#### **SOUTH AFRICA/AFRIQUE DU SUD**

Mr Makgolo Ansley MAKGOLO  
Assistant Director  
Cultural Resources Management  
Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism  
P/B X2 Rogge Bay 8012  
CAPE TOWN

Mr Sarel Van ZYL  
First Secretary  
South African Embassy  
414 Zenkyore, Building  
2-7-9 Hirakawa-cho  
TOKYO 102 0093

#### **SPAIN/ESPAGNE**

Mr Gerardo BUGALLO OTTONE  
Cultural Counsellor  
Embassy of Spain  
3-29, Roppongi, 1-Chome  
Minaki-ku  
TOKYO 106-0032

Mr José Miguel RUEDA MUNOZ DE SAN PEDRO  
Director general del Patrimonio Cultural  
MADRID

Dr Javier CASTROVIEJO BOLIBAR  
Chairman  
Spanish Committee for MAB Programme  
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente  
Pza. San Juan de la Cruz  
S/a, pl. 2a  
28071 MADRID

M. José Miguel RUEDA  
Directeur général,  
Patrimoine culturel de la Communauté de Madrid  
MADRID

Mme Alicia CASTRO MASAVEU  
Député du Parlement espagnol  
Conseiller municipal d'Oviedo  
Plaza de la Constitucion  
S/N OVIEDO

M. Juan VEGA ALONSO  
Conseiller de la Mairie d'Oviedo  
Plaza de la Constitucion  
S/N OVIEDO

Mr Francesc LLOP I BAYO  
Chief of Service of Archaeological Heritage  
Government of Land Valencia  
Avda. Campananar, 32  
E-4605 VALENCIA

Mr Ramon TEN CARNE  
Chief of Service of Archaeological Heritage  
Government of Catalonia  
Portaferriassa, 1  
08002 BARCELONA

M. Joaquin ISANEZ  
Directeur de l'Institut national d'Architecture  
Trinitarios 1  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Mrs Maria Rosa SUAREZ-INCLAN DUCASSI  
President  
ICOMOS-Spain  
Pº Castellana, 12, 4º  
MADRID 28046

Ms Dolores SILVESTRE  
ICOMOS Spanish National Committee  
Urbanizacion Las colinas, 22  
Hoyo de Manzanares  
28240 MADRID

Mr Javier MORALES  
ICOMOS Spanish National Committee  
Urbanizacion Las colinas, 22  
Hoyo de Manzanares  
28240 MADRID

M. Bartolomé GONZALEZ JIMENEZ  
Maire de Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Ms Noelia MARTIN GARCIA-ZARCO  
Asesora de Comunicacion  
Mairie de Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Mr Pablo GONZALES GARCIA  
Conseiller de la Mairie de Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

M. José Miguel POLO LORENZO  
Conseiller de la Mairie de Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Mr Cristobal VALLHONRAT  
Architect of the City Hall  
City Hall of Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Ms Beatriz DIAZ MANZANARES  
Councillor  
City Hall of Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Ms Olga RIUS GAZQUEZ  
Gerente  
University of Alcala de Henares  
Place San Diego S/N  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

Ms Marta VINUELAS PRADO  
Councillor  
City Hall of Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 12  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

M. José Javier OCANA RODRIGUEZ  
Conseiller de la Mairie d'Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 14  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

M. Manuel MAZO  
Vice-Recteur de l'Université d'Alcala de Henares  
Serida Perdida 21-5  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

M. Bartolomé GONZALEZ  
Maire d'Alcala de Henares  
Mairie d'Alcala de Henares  
Place Cervantes, nº 14  
28801 ALCALA DE HENARES

<b>SWEDEN/SUEDE</b>
---------------------

Mrs Birgitta HOBERG  
Executive International Officer  
National Heritage Board of Sweden  
P.O. Box 5405  
S-11484 STOCKHOLM

Mr Björn FRIES  
Vice-Mayor of Karlskrona  
Bastionsq. 20  
37130 KARLSKRONA

Mr Leifh STENHOLM  
Ph. Dr. County Antiquarian  
County Antiquarian  
Amiralitets st. 34  
37130 KARLSKRONA

**TURKEY/TURQUIE**

Mr Fazli CORMAN  
First Secretary  
Embassy of Turkey  
2-33-6, Jingumae, Shibuya-ku  
TOKYO 150-0001

**UKRAINE**

Mr Yuri LUTOVYNOV  
Third Secretary  
Embassy of Ukraine  
Shinagawa-ku, Kita-Shinagawa 5-6-26  
TOKYO

Mrs Bomdana URBAKOVYCH  
President  
Center for Adaptation of Historic Cities Architectural  
Environment  
Secretary of UC ICOMOS  
Esplanadna Str., 4  
Association of Ukrainian Cities  
KIEV

Mr Vasyl KUIBIDA  
Mayor  
City Administration  
L'viv, Str. P. Pancha 7/23

**UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME UNI**

Mr Nigel PITTMAN  
Head of Buildings, Monuments and Sites Division  
Department for Culture, Media and Sport  
2 - 4 Cockspur Street  
LONDON SW1Y 5DH

Dr Christopher John YOUNG  
Director for Hadrian's Wall  
World Heritage Policy Advisor, English Heritage,  
Abbey Gate House  
Market Street  
HEXHAM  
Northumberland NE46 3LX

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA/  
REPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE**

Mr Daniel Kyarvzi NDAGALA  
Commissioner for Culture  
Ministry of Education and Culture  
P.O. Box 9121  
DAR ES SALAAM

Mr MWALIM  
Architect  
AG. Director General  
Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority  
P.O. Box 4233  
ZANZIBAR

**UZBEKISTAN/OUZBEKISTAN**

Mr Bakhodir ABDURAKHIMOV  
Deputy-Minister of Cultural Affairs  
Ministry of Culture of Uzbekistan

Mr Timur DADABAEV  
Embassy Assistant  
Embassy of Uzbekistan  
Higashiyama-ku, Yamato-oji, Shijo Sagaru, Hakatacho  
73  
KYOTO

**VIETNAM**

Dr Truong Quoc Binh  
Deputy General Director of Preservation and Museology  
Department  
Ministry of Culture and Information  
51. Ngo Quejcer,  
HANOI  
Mr Pham Quang Tho  
Deputy Secretary-General  
Vietnamese National Commission for UNESCO  
8, Khuc Hao Str.  
HANOI

**III. INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS /  
ORGANISATIONS GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES**

**ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK**

Mr Nalin P. SAMARASINGHE  
Resident Representative  
Japanese Residence Office  
Yamato – Semei Bldg.  
1-7 Uchisaiwaicho, 1-Chome, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 100-0011  
Japan

**THE WORLD BANK / LA BANQUE MONDIALE**

Mr Ismail SERAGELDIN  
Vice-President  
1818 H Street  
N.W., WASHINGTON D.C. 20433  
United States of America

Ms Yoko EGUCHI  
Partnership  
1818 H Street  
N.W., WASHINGTON D.C. 20433  
United States of America

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT  
PROGRAMME (UNEP) / PROGRAMME DES  
NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT  
(PNUE)**

Mr Niclas SVENNINGSEN  
Industry Programme Officer  
UN Building, Rajadamman Avenue  
BANGKOK 10200  
Thailand

**IV. INTERNATIONAL NON –GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS/  
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES NON- GOUVERNEMENTALES**

**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS (IFLA) /  
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES  
ARCHITECTS PAYSAGISTES  
(IFLA)**

Mr Hans DORN  
Vice-President  
Chairman of the International IFLA Committee on  
Historical Landscapes and Gardens  
Holbeinstrasse 17  
D-60596 FRANKFURT/Main  
Germany

**ORGANIZATION OF WORLD HERITAGE CITIES  
(OWHC) / ORGANISATION DES VILLES DU  
PATRIMOINE MONDIAL (OVPM)**

Mr Denis RICARD  
Secretary General  
15 St-Nicolas  
QUEBEC  
Canada GIK IM8

**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR ANIMAL  
WELFARE (IFAW)**

Mr Mark J. SPALDING  
Basa Campaign Advisor, Habitat for Animals  
140, 12<sup>th</sup> St. Del Mar  
CA 92014-2315  
United States of America

**THE WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE/  
FONDS MONDIAL POUR LA NATURE  
(WWF)**

Mr James MARTIN-JONES  
Director, Global 200 Initiative  
1250 24 TH Street NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-1175  
United States of America

Ms Naoko FUNUHASHI  
3-4-9-210 Shimohoya, Hoya-shi  
TOKYO 202-0004  
Japan

**V. NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS /  
ORGANISATIONS NON-GOUVERNEMENTALES**

**ASIA/PACIFIC CULTURAL CENTRE FOR  
UNESCO (ACCU)**

Mr Muneharu KUSABA  
Director-General  
N° 6 Fukuromachi Shinjuku-ku  
TOKYO 162-8484  
Japan

Ms Tomoko SHIBAO  
Director, Cultural Affairs Division  
N° 6 Fukuromachi Shinjuku-ku  
TOKYO 162-8484  
Japan

**ENVIRONMENTAL DIPLOMACY INSTITUTE**

Mr Richard FORREST  
Programme Manager  
1201 Third Ave. 40<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
SEATTLE  
WA 98101  
United States of America

**FRIENDS OF THE EARTH (FOE)**

Mr Komei HOSOKAWA  
Associate Professor  
Faculty of Agriculture  
University of Saga  
SAGA City  
840-8502 Japan

Ms Aileen Mioko SMITH  
Campaigner  
Apt 103  
22-15 Tanaka Sekidencho, Sakyo-ku  
KYOTO 606  
Japan

**GUNDJEHMI ABORIGINAL CORPORATION**

Ms Yvonne MARGARULA  
Chairperson  
P.O. Box 245  
JABIRU Northern Territory O886  
Australia

Ms Jacqueline KATONA  
Executive Officer  
P.O. Box 245  
JABIRU Northern Territory O886  
Australia

**NATIONAL FEDERATION OF UNESCO  
ASSOCIATIONS IN JAPAN (NFUAJ)**

Mr Satoru MURAI  
Director-General  
Asahi-Seimei Ebisu Bldg. 12F  
1-3-1 Ebisu, Shibuya-ku  
TOKYO 150-0013  
Japan

Mr Jun YOSHIOKA  
Secretary-General  
Asahi-Seimei Ebisu Bldg. 12F  
1-3-1 Ebisu, Shibuya-ku  
TOKYO 150-0013  
Japan

Ms Naoko YOKOTE  
Program Officer  
Asahi-Seimei Ebisu Bldg. 12F  
1-3-1 Ebisu, Shibuya-ku  
TOKYO 150-0013  
Japan

**NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL  
(NRDC)**

Mr S. Jacob SCHERR  
Director, International Programme  
Natural Resources Defence Council  
1200 New York Ave. N.W.  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20005  
United States of America

Mr Joel R. REYNOLDS  
Director, Marine Mammal Protection Project  
Natural Resources Defence Council  
6310 San Vicente Blvd. # 250  
LOS ANGELES , CA 90048  
United States of America

**THE NATURE CONSERVATION SOCIETY OF JAPAN (NACS-J)**

Mr Masahito YOSHIDA  
Director of Conservation Science  
Yamaji-Sanbancho Bldg. 3F  
Sanbancho 5-24, Chiyoda-ku  
TOKYO 102-0075  
Japan

**PRO ESTEROS (MEXICO)**

Ms Laura MARTINEZ RIOS  
Chair  
4492 Camino de la Plaza, Suite ESE-1162  
SAN YSIDRO, CA 92173  
United States of America

Ms Patricia MARTINEZ RIOS  
Vice-President  
4492 Camino de la Plaza, Suite ESE-1162  
SAN YSIDRO, CA 92173  
United States of America

**RAMSAR CENTRE JAPAN**

Mr Toshiaki SONOHARA  
Shumei University  
1-1 Daigaku-cho  
Yachiyo-shi  
CHIBA  
276-0003 Japan

**THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY INC.**

Mr Alec MARR  
National Campaign Director  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Baileys Corner, London Circuit  
CANBERRA City ACT.  
Australia

Mrs Carol-Lynne DUDGEON  
P.O. Box 631  
JABIRU Nt  
Australia 0886

**THE WORLD MONUMENTS FUND**

Mr Bonnie BURNHAM  
President  
949 Park Avenue  
NEW YORK, NY 10028

**IV. UNESCO SECRETARIAT/ SECRETARIAT DE L'UNESCO**

**World Heritage Centre/  
Centre du patrimoine mondial**

Mr Bernd von DROSTE  
Director

Mr Georges ZOUAIN  
Deputy Director

Ms Minja YANG  
Director, Asia/Pacific Region and  
Information & Documentation  
Unit

Ms Galia SAOUMA-FORERO

Mr Natarajan ISHWARAN

Mr Herman van HOOFF

Ms Mechtild RÖSSLER

Ms Josette ERFAN

Ms Sarah TITCHEN

Ms Junko TANIGUCHI

Mr Masayuki MORI

Ms Johanna SULLIVAN

Ms Jane DEGEORGES

Ms Jocelyne POUTEAU

Ms Marianne RAABE

Mr David MARTEL

**Other UNESCO Divisions/  
Autres Divisions de l'UNESCO**

Mr Mounir BOUCHENAKI  
Director  
**Division of Cultural Heritage**

Ms Breda PAVLIC  
Director  
**Women and Gender Equality  
Unit**

Mr Richard ENGELHARDT  
Regional Advisor for Culture in  
Asia/Pacific  
**UNESCO Office in Bangkok**

Mr Laurent LEVI-STRAUSS  
**Division of Cultural Heritage**

Ms Mireille JARDIN  
**Division of Ecological Sciences**

Mr Alaistair McLURG  
**UNESCO Publishing Office**

Mr Mourad BOULARES  
**Interpretation Division**

## OPENING ADDRESS OF MOUNIR BOUCHENAKI, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNESCO TO THE 22ND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Mr Ambassador in Osaka representing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs,  
Mr Parliamentary Vice-Minister of Education, Science, Sports and Culture,  
Mr Governor of Kyoto Prefecture,  
Mr Mayor of Kyoto City,  
Mr Chairperson,  
Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

In opening the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee, as the Representative of the Director-General, I would like, first of all, to transmit to you, his personal regret in not being amongst us in the beautiful historic city of Kyoto. The venue of this year's session is particularly significant for the important work that awaits us, for Kyoto, is an example *par excellence*, of a capital founded on the intimate relationship between nature and culture, as well as a city that became the soul of Japan's national cultural identity by developing an original and outstanding culture by its creative genius and by appropriating and transforming the influences of other civilizations into its own. It is this ingenuity of the Japanese people, their capacity to adapt and create, that is one of the basis of their strength. And this strength is not only the economic power that it has today, but more importantly, the strength of social cohesion built on consensus, and the dynamics of its culture and its creativity.

I therefore wish to thank the generosity of the Government of Japan, the Prefecture and City of Kyoto, and, of course its citizens, for hosting the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee.

Japan is a relatively recent member of the World Heritage community, having become a State Party only in 1992. But its participation has given a strong impetus in widening the scope of reflection to make the World Heritage Convention more universal, particularly by addressing the fundamental issue of authenticity. The Nara Declaration on Authenticity, has today become an essential tool, not only in the evaluation of the cultural properties for inscription on the World Heritage List, but also in redefining the concept of integrity in relation to the now accepted notion of authenticity as defined in the Nara document.

My thanks to the Government of Japan must also be extended to its immense generosity towards the safeguarding of the world's cultural heritage through the Funds-in-Trust established within UNESCO. Most of the significant activities of UNESCO, such as the restoration of Angkor in Cambodia, Hue in VietNam, Mohenjodaro in Pakistan, the cultural triangle monuments of Sri Lanka, Palimpur in Bangladesh, and Vihara in Nepal, the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal, Sanchi and Satharta in India, the Nubia Museum of Asswan, the Probota Monastery in Romania, would not have been possible without the vision and generosity of the Japanese Government.

The year of Japan's accession to the World Heritage Convention was also the year the Director-General established UNESCO's World Heritage Centre. His objective was to create a transdisciplinary, inter-sectoral co-ordination unit at UNESCO

Headquarters, linked with a network of offices in several countries around the world to increase UNESCO's capacity to service the World Heritage Convention. We must not lose sight of the fundamental objective of the Convention, which is to challenge, collectively, the increasing threat on cultural and natural heritage posed by the changing social and economic conditions, as its preamble states. Furthermore, for this heritage to have a meaning to contemporary society and for world heritage to be transmitted to future generations, as Article 5 of the Convention enunciates, the States Parties to the Convention, individually and collectively, must be pro-active and preventive, as much as it needs to develop its reactive and corrective capacities.

The ambition of the World Heritage Convention is indeed colossal. It goes far beyond the mere collection of sites to demonstrate the diversity of species and typologies of cultures. Its *raison d'être* is for the protection of heritage of outstanding universal value to serve as the catalyst, for all nations and their people to protect all cultural and natural heritage bequeathed to humankind by nature and by past civilizations. And yet more, for the wealth of heritage to enrich present and future generations and to serve as inspirations for new creativity. The Convention specifically calls for States Parties to integrate cultural heritage protection into a comprehensive policy of territorial management, in other words to ensure that culture becomes part of the sustainable development process. In this regard, the cooperation of the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, whose representatives are here with us today, can be considered an important and promising step in that direction.

Raising awareness and support of people, especially the youth, to become active citizens in promoting an environmentally sustainable and culturally sensitive global community is one of the top priorities in the world heritage conservation process. The priority given to education at all levels of Government, and also the private sector, leading to the resurgence of Japan after the Second World War, should be a lesson to us all. Education, the building of intelligence, is the best investment for the future. It is for this reason that we are particularly proud of the growing success of the UNESCO Young Peoples World Heritage Education Project. Japan's support for this Project, tangibly demonstrated by the World Heritage Youth Forum being held now is yet another indication of the Japanese people's future-oriented disposition. I also wish to thank the Osaka Junior Chamber and the local authorities of Hiroshima, Kagoshima, Nara, and Osaka, which contributed generously for the organization of this Youth Forum.

Education, however, is not only about formal teaching. It is also about informing the public, raising public knowledge of the variety of factors that determine our lives and our future. Japan's active information industry, successfully developed on a partnership between the public and private sectors, has also played an important role in educating the Japanese (people). It was therefore with great gratitude, that UNESCO accepted the partnership extended by Japan's media industry for the production of world heritage information materials. Documentary films on World Heritage sites produced by the Tokyo

Broadcasting Systems are being aired throughout Japan every week, while others produced by Walk Corporation are being distributed as home video collections. Kodansha, Japan's leading publishing company has co-produced with their international partners, an impressive encyclopedia on World Heritage sites. Other media partners in Japan, too numerous to cite, have supported UNESCO's activities on world heritage conservation in various forms. Japanese information and informatics companies and research institutes are also actively involved. Only last week, Gifu University hosted a remarkable international scientific congress on the application of virtual reality technology for world heritage management and next week, Waseda University with the support of Japan's media industry will be holding a congress, in Kyoto, on new information technology for cultural and natural heritage conservation. I take this opportunity, on behalf of the Director-General to thank them all, for their very important intellectual and financial contributions for the benefit of world heritage.

Que ce soit pour l'assistance à la définition de politiques de conservation, que ce soit pour le développement de programmes, jusqu'à leur mise en œuvre, que ce soit pour les projets d'éducation et d'information du public, l'UNESCO est sollicitée quotidiennement aussi bien par les autorités nationales que locales, par les gestionnaires de sites, les Instituts de recherche et de développement, les médias ou encore par de simples citoyens qui souhaitent défendre la cause du patrimoine. Le Centre du patrimoine a contribué de manière significative à renforcer la capacité de l'UNESCO de répondre à ces défis, de même qu'il a aidé à mieux faire entendre la voix des Etats parties à la Convention par le biais du Comité et du Bureau du patrimoine mondial et à la faire respecter à travers le monde. Le Directeur général a fait tout ce qui était en son pouvoir pour doter le Centre des ressources humaines et financières, et se considère fier, à juste titre, de son initiative. Il reste, bien entendu, plusieurs aspects du travail à améliorer. L'audit de gestion mené par les auditeurs externes de l'UNESCO a certainement contribué au processus d'amélioration de l'efficacité du Centre. Certaines faiblesses relevées par l'audit, notamment dans la gestion financière, ont été immédiatement prises en considération et le Directeur général a nommé à cet effet un administrateur chevronné au courant de cette année. Les 35 recommandations formulées par les Auditeurs sur les questions de gestion ont été examinées avec soin et sont suivies de mesures correctives. Le Directeur général souhaite remercier le Comité de l'initiative prise à cet égard et espère que ce processus d'évaluation critique puisse être mené de façon périodique, de façon à apporter les réponses adéquates à un processus évolutif et dont la complexité n'échappe à personne. C'est le défi permanent auquel sont confrontés tous ceux qui ont pour charge la conservation du patrimoine mondial.

A ce défi, le Professeur Francioni a répondu de façon exemplaire au cours de son mandat de Président du Comité et je souhaiterais ici, au nom du Directeur général, le remercier et le féliciter tout à la fois pour son engagement et pour les succès obtenus. Je suis persuadé qu'il continuera à apporter au Comité et au Centre son expérience, ses connaissances et sa sagesse.

Les multiples défis, le travail à mener avec exigence dans ce domaine en appellent à tous les acteurs de la conservation à unir leurs forces dans un effort collectif pour la réussite de cette mission exaltante. Le Comité du patrimoine mondial, les Etats parties, les Organisations internationales gouvernementales, les Organisations non gouvernementales et l'UNESCO doivent à présent aller plus loin en définissant une stratégie commune où chacun jouera pleinement son rôle afin de renforcer l'autorité et le

poids moral de la Convention. La force de la Convention ne peut, en effet, être mesurée seulement à l'aune des ressources humaines et financières qu'elle sera en mesure de mobiliser. Cette force va plus loin: elle se trouve en réalité dans un message éthique. Son aptitude à persuader, influencer, et mobiliser réflexion et action en faveur de la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel ne pourra être renforcée que si la Convention est mise en œuvre de façon crédible. Pour cela, l'UNESCO et son Centre attendent beaucoup de l'Assemblée des Etats parties et du Comité du patrimoine mondial afin qu'ils puissent aider les Etats à répondre aux obligations auxquelles ils ont souscrit. On attend aussi qu'ils aident l'UNESCO et ses organes consultatifs, ICCROM, ICOMOS et UICN, à renforcer leur capacité d'action.

A cet égard, je voudrais remercier le Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties d'avoir adopté le principe du rapport périodique sur l'état de conservation des sites inscrits, de même que j'exprime ma gratitude pour tous ceux qui ont aidé à améliorer la représentativité de la Liste grâce aux apports de la Stratégie globale. Aujourd'hui, la stratégie pour la formation, afin qu'elle réponde aux besoins des Etats parties, qu'il faut affiner, c'est aussi la stratégie pour l'information et la promotion qu'il faut discuter afin que des orientations claires puissent être énoncées facilitant du coup la collaboration entre les différents partenaires: Etats parties, UNESCO, firmes publiques ou privées. Il va sans dire que c'est la « diversité créatrice » comme le soulignait le titre du rapport Perez de Cuellar, que nous sommes là pour défendre, qui implique la recherche de solutions diverses. C'est pour permettre à cette diversité qui fait notre richesse que des orientations stratégiques sont nécessaires dans le cadre de la réalisation des objectifs généraux de la Convention qui reste en définitive notre but commun.

En vous souhaitant plein succès dans vos délibérations, le Directeur général m'a chargé de souligner, une fois encore, et en son nom, que la Convention du patrimoine mondial ne saurait être considérée seule sans qu'il n'y ait un lien avec le développement, fondé sur la reconnaissance et la protection de la diversité des cultures et de l'inclusion sociale.

En conclusion, j'aimerais dire quelques mots pour souligner combien le Directeur général a apprécié mon collègue M. von Droste, qui a servi et qui sert l'Organisation depuis plus de 25 ans avec un sens élevé du devoir et une haute conscience professionnelle. Il a, vous le savez, participé aux sessions de votre Comité et ce, depuis la toute première tenue à Paris en 1977 et l'on peut dire que depuis lors il en a été le pilier. Le rôle extrêmement important qu'il a joué à l'UNESCO, d'abord comme Directeur au Secteur des Sciences, puis comme Directeur du Centre, est reconnu de tous, aussi bien à l'UNESCO que dans la communauté internationale du patrimoine. Au nom de l'UNESCO, en ma qualité de représentant du Directeur général, mais aussi comme collègue et ami de plus de quinze ans, je voudrais dire à Bernd, merci. Nous savons que nous pouvons compter sur toi pour continuer à défendre la cause, notre cause du patrimoine.

Enfin, un tout dernier mot dans ce message du Directeur général, il me restait en effet à présenter tous les vœux de notre Directeur général au futur Président du Comité du patrimoine mondial, en l'assurant de notre totale disponibilité.



**MESSAGE OF H.E. MR. MASAHIKO KOUMURA, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
OF JAPAN, AT THE OPENING OF THE 22ND SESSION OF  
THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE IN KYOTO**

(Read by Mr. Hiromi SATO, Ambassador Stationed in Osaka  
Representing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Distinguished delegates to the World Heritage Committee, Honored observers, Esteemed members of the UNESCO Secretariat, Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a great honor and pleasure for Japan to welcome you to Kyoto for the 22nd Session of the World Heritage Committee, which plays an important role in preserving the World Heritage as a common asset of all mankind. The Japanese people, who have a profound interest in conserving the World Heritage and in this Kyoto conference, sincerely hope for its success.

I firmly believe Kyoto is an appropriate historical and cultural city for this meeting, as evidenced by the registration of the "Historic Monuments of Ancient Kyoto" as World Heritage four years ago.

Ladies and gentlemen,

In 1992, Japan became a state party to the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, and this Convention advocates an important philosophy for Japan in two respects. First, the Convention aims to protect both cultural and natural heritage together—under a single framework—as an asset of all mankind. As evident in the shrines, temples and gardens of Kyoto, Japan's traditional culture has developed in harmony with its seasons, climate and other natural features since ancient times. The Japanese people thus have a deep and profound understanding for the spirit and meaning of the Convention, which recognizes the close interrelationship between culture and nature. Secondly, the Convention acknowledges that while the preservation of cultural and natural heritage is first and foremost the responsibility of the nation to which it belongs, this heritage is also the world heritage of mankind as a whole, and the entire international community therefore has a duty to participate and cooperate in its preservation. Respect another country's heritage and cooperating in its preservation also means understanding and respecting the history, culture and values of that country. Japan considers international cultural exchange to be an important pillar of its foreign policy, and it strives to contribute to world peace by promoting mutual understanding among peoples of different nations through various exchanges, including cooperation for the conservation of cultural and natural properties. The idea of the World Heritage Convention therefore holds great importance for Japan.

The Government and people of Japan have vigorously taken part in the activities of UNESCO and its initiatives to preserve the World Heritage. The Japanese Trust Fund for the Preservation of the World Cultural Heritage that Japan set up within UNESCO prior to its becoming a party to the World Heritage Convention is one such example. The Fund supports a wide range of activities, including preliminary surveys, actual preservation and restoration of cultural properties around the world, as well as the dispatch of experts and staff and the training of local personnel for this purpose. Both inside and outside the framework of UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention, Japan is engaged in a variety of activities, including: (1) the provision of materials and equipment for the preservation of cultural properties under the Cultural Grant Aid component of our ODA program; (2) international joint research on preservation and restoration of properties at the National Research Institute of Cultural Properties; and (3) cooperation for conservation and management efforts in the World Natural Heritage sites of Asia, etc. In 1947, Japan became the first

country in the world where a private-sector movement towards direct cooperation with UNESCO began. Today, those initial efforts have blossomed into a network of 275 local UNESCO associations which also take part in cooperative activities for the preservation of the World Heritage throughout the country. Japan hopes to continue to work with UNESCO as well as with other national governments and NGOs to preserve cultural and natural heritage.

Ladies and gentlemen,

With the end of the Cold War, cultural differences in the broader sense are gradually replacing ideological differences as an important element in international politics. Under such circumstances, the members of the international community must rise to the challenge to overcome their cultural differences through human compassion and universal values, and must pursue the harmonious coexistence of their different cultures through mutual acceptance. At the same time, as our international community faces increasingly serious global environmental problems, it goes without saying that it becomes an ever more imperative and significant challenge for all of humanity to pursue sustainable development in harmony with the precious natural environment bestowed upon us. As we resolutely turn to face these challenges, I am confident that the World Heritage Convention will play an even larger role in the future.

In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the people of Kyoto Prefecture and Kyoto City for their great efforts in serving as hosts, to all those concerned with this conference, and to the staff of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre who have been working so hard to prepare for this event. I am confident in the success of the conference and look forward to the further development of activities for the protection of the World Heritage.

Thank you for your kind attention.

## **SPEECH OF MR. KENSAKU MORITA, PARLIAMENTARY VICE-MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE, SPORTS AND CULTURE**

Mr. Chairperson of the World Heritage committee,  
Distinguished Delegates,  
Members of the UNESCO Secretariat,  
Ladies and Gentlemen

At the opening of the Twenty-Second session of the World Heritage Committee, I would like to extend my warmest welcome to those who came here from a great distance to attend this Committee Session.

I also express my gratitude for the efforts of the Chairperson of the Committee, Mr. Francesco Francioni and the Secretariat of UNESCO for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention during this past year and for the preparation of this Session.

In today's society, the role of the protection of our heritage is further and further increasing in importance. I am convinced that heritage should be essential for the meaningful appreciation of the history and culture of one's country. I believe that it is most important for heritage to foster in the minds and hearts of young people the love of culture and peace.

Among the various programs of heritage protection, because of its broad popularity -- among both adults and children -- the World Heritage Convention has an especially important role in our society.

I am aware that the World Heritage Committee has been discussing at length many important issues which take initiative in the field of heritage protection, as part of what we identify as our Global Strategy. In 1994, our government was honored to host one of the experts meetings - "the Nara Conference on Authenticity."

I am aware that the Committee has been making efforts to understand heritage in total, taking into account cultural diversity and also heritage diversity, and taking full advantage of the core concept of the Convention which links culture and nature in one framework.

I would like to commend these important steps, which also serve as models for our country.

We Japanese have traditionally loved nature since ages past, and we are proud of our life in harmony with nature.

The beauty of Japanese architecture which takes full advantage of the character of natural materials like wood or paper, and the beauty of Japanese gardens which are created to express the spirit of nature - these are among the Japanese cultural traits which we are proud of as heritage of universal value.

Our legal protection system of cultural heritage started in the latter half of the last century. One distinctive feature of our system is that we protect not only tangible properties but also intangible and folk-cultural properties such as festivals, performing arts and traditional crafts as a total expression of our culture at large. I am aware that the new concept of "cultural landscape" has been introduced into World Heritage Convention practice. We have also been protecting heritage in the category of the "cultural landscape" for a long time, since the beginning of this century including the properties such as places of scenic beauty which have been long revered by Japanese people and which have been depicted in countless poems and paintings. Kyoto has served as a fountainhead of our culture for over a millennium, and it is great pleasure to be able to invite you here on this occasion.

Mr. Chairperson, Distinguished Delegates,  
Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my sincere desire and hope that the important matters at hand will be discussed in detail during this Committee Session which starts today, and that successful results will be achieved for the protection of World Heritage.

Now let me conclude my speech by saying that I have great trust that this Session will contribute to the progress of further co-operation of the member states for the protection of World Heritage .

Thank you very much for your kind attention.

**SPEECH OF THE GOVERNOR OF KYOTO PREFECTURE, H.E. TEIICHI ARAMAKI  
TO THE 22ND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Ladies and gentlemen,

As representative of the 2.6 million people of Kyoto Prefecture, I express my heartfelt gratitude to the Chairperson, members of the delegations, and all other attendants, for coming to Kyoto.

As Governor of Kyoto Prefecture, I am very glad to see the 22nd Session of the World Heritage Committee being held in Kyoto, with the participation of people from many countries. I am honored to give an address of welcome to you.

Since their advent on Earth, human beings throughout their long history have developed civilization in close contact with nature. Cultural and natural heritages, bequeathed by our ancestors, have nurtured people's love of, and pride in, their home country, and enriched people's spiritual life.

With the passage of time, however, some of these precious heritages have been impaired or destroyed. As well, the impairment or destruction of such heritages as a result of industrial development has become a serious problem, particularly in modern times.

The conservation of cultural and natural heritages requires considerable funding, technology and knowledge. It also presupposes efforts by countries and municipalities, and international cooperation.

Among such heritages are those that are particularly important, and valuable for all humans. It is a task of modern people to designate such heritages, conserve them through international cooperation, and bequeath them to future generations. Evidently, the task has grown in importance and urgency in recent years.

Under these circumstances, the role of the World Heritage Committee has grown in importance. We people of Kyoto Prefecture are proud of Kyoto's designation as host of the Committee's Meeting. The Kyoto prefectural government is undertaking PR efforts throughout the Prefecture to ensure the Meeting's success. The prefectural government is also making various preparations for the smooth management of the Meeting, in cooperation with the Kyoto municipal government and local organizations concerned.

As a local government responsible for the protection of local cultural properties, the Kyoto prefectural government is engaged in the repair of such properties, National Treasures and Important Cultural Assets. Kyoto takes pride in its traditional techniques for repairing wooden structures and in its other techniques, unique in the world for their sophistication.

The prefectural government is actively promoting international exchange programs between Kyoto and nearby Asian countries, including technical cooperation in the field of cultural property protection.

With the Meeting as an encouragement, the prefectural government intends to increase its efforts to foster people's interest in cultural and natural heritages, protect precious heritages in Kyoto Prefecture, and bequeath them to future generations.

Kyoto has a long history, which began in the 8th century when it was designated the capital of Japan. Cultural properties in the ancient capital, registered as World Cultural Heritage, are highly important, as representing the quintessence of Japanese culture. I presume that this point was brought home to you during yesterday's excursion.

Kyoto also boasts rich historical heritages, and a variegated traditional culture which continues today. This culture, loved by people in Japan and abroad, is exemplified by original paintings, objects of industrial art, architectures, gardens, tea ceremony, and flower arrangement techniques.

Furthermore, Kyoto Prefecture is home to up-to-date facilities for academic and technological research. Kansai Science City in particular, developed in the Prefecture as a national project, features the establishment of original research organizations, as well as of corporations that are internationally active thanks to their advanced technologies.

As I have explained, Kyoto Prefecture is an area where old tradition lives in harmony with modernity. I will be glad if you make yourself familiar with various aspects of Kyoto during your stay in Japan.

I expect that you will engage in active discussion during the six-day period of the Conference. It is my hope that the Meeting will produce significant results, thanks to your brilliant intellects. I offer my best wishes for your continued health and prosperity.

Thank you.

**SPEECH OF MR. YORIKANE MASUMOTO, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF KYOTO  
TO THE OPENING OF THE 22ND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

(Welcome to Kyoto. I am Yorikane Masumoto, the mayor of City of Kyoto.)

Together with the 1,460,000 citizens of Kyoto, I would like to express my hearty welcome to you, who have gathered here from all over the world to participate in the 22nd Session of the World Heritage Committee.

Today, as the representative of the host cities, I am privileged to have this opportunity to talk to you and discuss the conservation of cultural and natural heritages with outstanding universal value, that are placed under our care.

Our predecessors made every effort to protect these heritages and now we are faced with the great responsibility for handing down these precious treasures to the future generations.

The City of Kyoto has 14 Historic Monuments of Ancient Kyoto included in the World Heritage List. Our city has a long history of conserving historical properties and teaching its own citizens as well as other's about the significance of its heritage, the importance of conservation, as well as the cultural value of each property.

To host this conference, the city and affiliated organizations have formed the Kyoto Committee for Support of the 22nd Session of the World Heritage Committee, which has worked together to give all of you a warm reception and to support to the success of this important conference.

It is said that the 21st century will be a century of spiritual rediscovery. Despite, or perhaps due to globalization and the rapid development of science and technology, and increasingly highly information-oriented society, not only material but also spiritual wealth will be in demand.

Under these circumstances, it can be said that conservation of the World Heritage sites become will increasingly significant because these monuments help people understand and tolerate different cultures as well as giving us spiritual satisfaction.

Enveloped in the beautiful natural surroundings, Kyoto has over 2,000 historical properties including National Treasures and Places of Scenic Beauty. They are our inheritance of over 1,200 years of history. As the treasury of Japanese culture, Kyoto represents the soul of the Japanese people.

As the mayor of this city, it is my duty to preserve Kyoto, the city of beautiful nature and bountiful cultures, as a place for people of the world to meet in place and exchange ideas and cultures beyond the differences of race, religion or social structure.

It is now the most beautiful season in Kyoto. The whole city is ablaze with autumn leaves. On this occasion. it gives me a great pleasure that you have an opportunity to contemplate the natural and cultural aspects of this city.

I truly believe that, with your effort, this conference will achieve a brilliant success contributing to the later generations.

Finally, I am grateful to members of UNESCO and persons concerned for preparing the conference thoroughly.

I wish the prosperity of you and your nations.

November 30, 1998  
Yorikane Masumoto  
Mayor, City of Kyoto

## **SPEECH BY H.E. MR MATSUURA KOÏCHIRO, AMBASSADOR OF JAPAN IN FRANCE TO THE 22ND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Mesdames, Messieurs les Ambassadeurs,  
Mesdames, Messieurs les représentants des délégations pour le  
Comité du patrimoine mondial,  
Mesdames, Messieurs.

Je suis extrêmement honoré d'avoir été choisi pour présider cette conférence sur le patrimoine mondial, et je tiens à vous remercier chaleureusement de votre soutien. Je promets de m'efforcer de consacrer toute l'énergie que requièrent cette tâche et cette responsabilité.

Je tiens aussi à exprimer mon profond respect et mes sincères remerciements au Professeur Francioni qui a occupé au cours de cette année la présidence du Comité. Le Professeur Francioni a assumé ses responsabilités de Président avec un enthousiasme et une efficacité précieuse. Il a fait preuve de capacités remarquables dans ses fonctions, contribuant largement à la préservation du patrimoine mondial.

Mesdames, Messieurs,

Permettez-moi tout d'abord de vous exposer brièvement mes convictions en tant que Président.

Comme vous le savez, l'UNESCO a pour idée fondamentale de faire progresser la compréhension mutuelle et la coopération entre tous les pays, dans les domaines de l'éducation, des sciences et de la culture, et de contribuer à la réalisation de la paix dans la communauté internationale. Avec le processus de mondialisation qui s'est développé en particulier ces dernières années, je pense qu'une meilleure compréhension des différences culturelles existant entre pays, devient primordiale.

Le Japon quant à lui, tout en conservant les fondements de sa spécificité culturelle, a connu, dans l'antiquité, des influences culturelles diverses, en particulier de l'Inde, de la Chine, et de la péninsule coréenne, puis plus récemment, de l'Europe et des Etats-Unis. Sa culture a ainsi évolué dans une harmonie enrichie par ces diversités extrêmes. L'idée de « tolérance » nourrie tout au long de ce processus, ainsi que celle d'« harmonie », spécifique à l'Asie et appelée « wa » en japonais, ne sont-elles pas des bases fondamentales pour l'UNESCO du 21<sup>ème</sup> siècle ?

L'UNESCO du prochain millénaire, encore plus qu'avant, aura pour mission de prêter davantage attention aux diversités régionales existant dans le monde et il lui faudra enrichir encore plus profondément sa nature même d'organisme à vocation intellectuelle.

Si nous pensons à l'UNESCO du 21<sup>ème</sup> siècle en ces termes, alors il est indéniable que la Convention du Patrimoine mondial a une immense signification. La culture de chaque pays possède une histoire, un passé, et la volonté de les respecter s'exprime, en un sens, par la sauvegarde de son patrimoine afin de pouvoir le léguer aux générations futures. En un quart de siècle, la Convention du Patrimoine mondial a obtenu de bons résultats en matière de préservation du patrimoine mondial. Si nous voulons définir la mission originelle de cette Convention, nous pourrions sans aucun doute dire qu'elle est naturellement de veiller à l'équilibre géographique, et d'assurer l'universalité. Le débat sur

ce sujet progresse actuellement dans la direction souhaitée, et j'accueille favorablement cette progression. Je pense qu'il faut élargir ce caractère universel à l'ensemble des activités de l'UNESCO.

Mesdames, Messieurs,

J'aimerais maintenant aborder brièvement trois problèmes auxquels le patrimoine mondial doit faire face:

Tout d'abord, je pense qu'il faut continuer le débat pour résoudre le problème du déséquilibre géographique concernant le nombre de sites classés patrimoine mondial. Plus particulièrement, nous devons désormais nous tourner vers des régions sous-représentées et accueillir leurs patrimoines.

Ensuite, je pense que la question du critère d'« authenticité » du patrimoine culturel est très importante. Il s'agit de savoir comment harmoniser la différence entre la « culture de la pierre », plus facile à léguer aux générations futures, et la « culture du bois » qui nécessite des restaurations pour sa conservation.

Enfin, concernant les relations avec l'UNESCO, j'aimerais continuer à débattre avec vous tous de la façon la plus efficace de mettre en œuvre cette Convention. A cet égard, je tiens à exprimer ma sincère admiration pour les activités que le Centre du Patrimoine mondial, Secrétariat de la Convention, a développées jusqu'ici.

Mesdames, Messieurs,

Je suis très heureux que la 22<sup>ème</sup> Conférence sur le Patrimoine mondial se déroule aujourd'hui ici, à Kyoto, capitale historique du Japon, et je pense que cela a une profonde signification.

Depuis plus de 1200 ans, la ville de Kyoto a prospéré en tant que centre culturel japonais, ceci malgré les vicissitudes de la politique interne. En effet, cette ville est véritablement le reflet de l'importance de la culture. A la fin de la guerre, le vœu le plus cher de la population japonaise toute entière était que l'Archipel revienne au sein de la communauté internationale. Le peuple japonais ayant souffert des horreurs de la guerre, a partagé au plus profond de lui-même l'idéal de l'UNESCO, et c'est pourquoi des mouvements de citoyens visant à coopérer avec l'UNESCO ont émergé dans différentes régions du Japon. C'est ici même à Kyoto que, déjà quatre ans avant l'adhésion du Japon à l'UNESCO, en 1947, l'Association de Kyoto pour la coopération avec l'UNESCO a été créée. Aujourd'hui encore, elle poursuit ses activités avec grand enthousiasme.

Mesdames, Messieurs,

Pour conclure, je promets de consacrer toute l'énergie nécessaire à l'accomplissement de ma tâche de Président, et j'ai l'honneur de solliciter votre coopération et votre soutien.  
Je vous remercie de votre attention.

**"The World Heritage and the World Bank:  
Conserving the Touchstones of our Memory"  
Remarks by Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President, The World Bank  
at the 22nd Session of The World Heritage Committee**

Mr. Chairman,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I bring you greetings from Mr. James D. Wolfensohn, President of The World Bank who has truly redefined the Bank into a champion of poverty reduction, empowerment and inclusion, and a committed partner for all those concerned with culture and the development paradigm.

**The Position of the World Bank:**

Let me at the outset declare the complete support of the World Bank to the World Heritage Convention, and its programs. We are here to help you translate the purposes of the convention into action!

The context of this support is the initiative of Mr. Wolfensohn to systematize our support to culture in the heart of the Bank's mission of poverty reduction, empowerment and sustainable development. I presented its outline at Stockholm earlier this year. We elaborated its contents in a conference on "Culture in Sustainable Development", co-sponsored with UNESCO, and held at the World Bank last September.

The Bank will be active in three areas:

- Conceptual analyses, on the contributions of cultural expression to empowerment and linking diversity with the challenge of inclusion. But, we will also be putting special emphasis on the economic justification of investments in culture, recognizing its intrinsic existence value, its public goods character and the positive externalities that it brings. That is essential.
- We intend to support financially and technically, in alliance with others, the protection of the cultural heritage of the past as well as the expression of local culture of today, for that will be the heritage of tomorrow.
- We intend to work in partnerships with each and everyone of you, in reinforced networks of the committed, so that the whole of our efforts is more than the sum of the parts. The private sector, the civil society and all stakeholders must be part of this "coalition of the caring".

**The Meaning of the Past:**

The heritage of the past is our living memory. Even more important, it is the wellspring of creativity and the foundation of identity, without which we are all like amnesiacs not knowing where we go, because we do not know who we are or where we came from.

The World Heritage list defines a common heritage of all of humanity. These sites, have truly become the "touchstones of our memory". We must avoid their destruction by inappropriate development, or their excessive commercial exploitation. In that context, I am delighted to invite you all to an exhibition by the World Bank that addresses the very theme of a heritage at risk

which is being held at Ritsumeikan University which I will be opening this evening with Mr. Bouchenaki of UNESCO.

On the justifications for borrowing for, and investing in, culture, we advocate rigor in both financial and economic analyses. In the public finance realm, always ask who pays and who benefits? In economic analysis we must recognize the existence values and the intrinsic worth of cultural heritage, not just what it can generate as tourist revenues. This is not to deny the importance of tourism, but it cannot be the sole justification of investments in conserving cultural heritage.

This said, the World Bank is willing to finance operations in support of conserving the world heritage sites, provided that these are imbedded in a broader developmental endeavor, in all countries who seek such loans and credits from us.

We are already active in this area: Natural sites are treated in environmental operations, historic cities are treated in the context of urban projects - most recently a loan to Morocco for the rehabilitation of Fez, approved by our board last month. We need to do much more.

Excellences,  
Mesdames, Messieurs,

Il faut agir, pour assurer la protection du patrimoine culturel tout en répondant aux besoins des pauvres et des démunis. La modernisation n'est pas synonyme d'occidentalisation. Le Japon a prouvé qu'un pays pouvait se moderniser et être compétitif sans perdre son identité. La promotion d'une culture intégrée et intégrante demeure la clé essentielle du devenir des sociétés. Intégrée du fait d'être cohérente dans ses éléments constitutifs, intégrante dans sa capacité d'adopter le nouveau, et d'évoluer vers de nouveaux horizons.

On ne peut s'occuper du patrimoine en ignorant les conditions de populations autochtones qui les côtoient. Nous avons besoin d'un modèle de développement basé sur la personne humaine, qui responsabilise les gens, habilite les femmes, principaux vecteurs du changement, en reconnaissant les éléments positifs de leur patrimoine culturel. Nous avons besoin d'un modèle qui assure le changement dans la continuité, qui protège les repères de la mémoire, et renforce la solidarité locale et mondiale.

Regardez les pays pauvres aujourd'hui. Réservoirs des sites les plus extraordinaires, ils font face à une pression démographique énorme, tandis qu'ils demeurent

Frappés par la sécheresse ou les inondations  
Matraqués par la chute des cours des matières premières  
Etranglés par la pénurie de leurs moyens financiers  
Contraints par les règles du jeu de la dette . . . qui souvent n'est qu'un habillage statistique de la myopie des uns et la misère des autres . . .

Face à ces énormes défis, nous devons tous les aider. Mais, plus encore, la population de chacun de ces pays, doit garder son assurance, sa dignité, sa volonté de tracer son parcours avec réalisme, sérénité, et l'espoir de créer un avenir voulu.

Pour répondre à ces défis, et traduire notre volonté commune de protéger ce remarquable patrimoine de l'humanité, ces repères de la mémoire, il faut être *pragmatique* dans la recherche des solutions. Il faudra de la souplesse, de la flexibilité, de l'imagination, du nouveau. Il faudra encadrer la protection du passé dans un projet social pour l'avenir.

Finalement, il faut *adopter l'approche participative*. En définitive, toute action soutenue a besoin de l'apport des individus. Pour cela, il

faut rendre à chaque acteur social, à chaque particulier, l'espace nécessaire pour une véritable contribution. Il faut que la protection du patrimoine soit intégrée dans un *projet de société* ou chaque individu se sente engagé, responsable —comme disait Saint-Exupéry: "Etre homme, c'est être responsable-c'est sentir en posant sa pierre que l'on contribue à bâtir le monde."

La Banque Mondiale est votre partenaire dans cette entreprise.

**SPEECH BY MR. NALIN P. SAMARASINGHE,  
RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVE TO JAPAN OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK TO  
THE 22nd SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Mr Chairman, Distinguished delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me begin these brief remarks by stating how honoured I am to represent the Asian Development Bank at the Twenty-Second Session of the World Heritage Committee at this most appropriate venue ... this scenic and cultural gem, Kyoto. The role of the Bank is to promote the economic and social development of the Asia-Pacific region, and an essential element of that role involves helping to ensure that such development is in harmony with broader cultural and environmental goals. My remarks today have three objectives: first, to provide some information about the Bank and what it does, as there are delegates from non-member countries present here; second, to examine briefly the Bank's strategic objectives and how these relate to your own objectives; and third, to give some specific examples of what the Bank has done to promote World Heritage activities.

In 1997, the Bank provided over \$9 billion in loans and \$162 million in technical assistance grants. Fourteen of the countries that received Bank assistance in 1997 have a total of 103 World Heritage Sites. It is clear, therefore, that the Bank provides significant support for countries with World Heritage Sites. The question is, of course, how does Bank assistance relate either directly or indirectly to what this Committee is trying to do. This is an important question to which I will return in a moment.

The Bank has five strategic objectives that guide its lending and technical assistance program. They are: first, to promote economic growth; second, to support poverty reduction; third, to support human development; four, to promote gender and development; and five, to protect the environment and promote sustainable development.

Let us quickly take a closer look at these strategic objectives and examine how they are related to the objectives of the World Heritage Convention. What about economic growth? It is quite obvious that there can be no sustainable economic development without attention to larger social and environmental issues-- a fact well recognized by the Convention. In fact, the purpose of the Convention is to help preserve sites important to our cultural and natural environments. The Bank also recognizes the need to preserve cultural and heritage sites even as it promotes economic growth. These sites, properly preserved and managed can be considered economic resources as well as part of our natural or cultural heritage. The Bank has supported projects that aim to generate income from such resources without destroying them in the process--- forestry management projects, fisheries projects, eco-tourism projects all involve learning to use resources while preserving them.

Poverty reduction is another of the Bank's strategic objectives. How is this related to World Heritage Sites? The answer is that poverty and the associated need to earn income by any means possible is a major cause of environmental degradation ranging from deforestation to coral reef destruction for quick economic gain. The Bank seeks to develop ways of enabling the poor to improve their earnings while sustaining the environment. In

fact, cultural and natural heritage sites can be used to enhance income if they are utilized in a careful and sustainable manner.

Human development is a major thrust of the Bank. Human development includes education, health and nutrition, among other things. How is this related to World Heritage Sites? Your Young People's World Heritage Education Project implies recognition that education is an essential tool of promoting and protecting our heritage. We can certainly agree that education has a critical role to play in promoting awareness of our heritage and in teaching ways to preserve it. The Bank supports education in many countries, and many of the Bank-assisted projects provide resources for curriculum and instructional materials that contribute to a child's growing awareness of cultural and natural resources. The Bank also supports environmental education in the general sense of upgrading popular awareness of environmental issues and in the technical sense of training environmental scientists. Both are important if a country is to improve awareness of its cultural and natural heritage and to develop strategies for preserving these.

Protection of the environment is a major objective. How is this related to World Heritage Sites? In preparing an investment project, the Bank requires that an environmental impact assessment be completed to ensure that the project can be designed in such a way as to reflect environmental considerations. The Bank's environmental policy and guidelines make specific reference to World Heritage Sites and require that efforts be made to ensure that these are not negatively affected by Bank-assisted projects. In fact, the Bank has environmental specialists whose task it is to assess environmental impact and to help ensure that Bank-assisted projects do not damage sites of natural or cultural value. The Bank has recently issued a set of policy guidelines on dealing with indigenous peoples to ensure that the traditional way of life of these groups--- themselves often a part of our cultural heritage--- are not negatively affected by Bank-assisted activities.

Let us now look at a few specific examples of what the Bank has done that relates directly to the objectives of the World Heritage Convention. In 1997 alone, the Bank approved \$378 million in loans projects with environmental objectives, and \$20 million in technical assistance projects that support environmental activities. A few years ago, the Bank co-financed with UNESCO and UNIDO a technical assistance project in India to prepare a plan to improve the environment and promote sustainable development in Agra---the site of the Taj Mahal whose beauty was threatened by severe air pollution generated by local industries and households.. A subsequent loan project for \$150 million included funds to construct a branch liquefied petroleum gas pipeline to Acra to help provide non-polluting household fuel.

The \$15 million Siam Reap Airport Project in Cambodia helped to develop an airport to improve access by tourists to Angkor Wat, another World Heritage Site. A \$23 million tourism development project in Nepal--- a country with four World Heritage Sites--- has helped to develop tourism that does not destroy the beauty that



attracts it.

A regional technical assistance project on Measuring Environmental Quality in Asia implemented in collaboration with Harvard University developed a set of indicators for monitoring environmental changes. Another project on Acid Rain and Emission Control in Asia was implemented in several countries, including the People's Republic of China where the Ministry of Science and Technology and UNESCO were both involved with the Bank in an effort which aims, in part, to help preserve cultural monuments being corroded by air pollution. The Bank has also funded the development of an environmental education master plan in the Philippines to help, among other things, strengthen the way in which environmental issues and concepts are integrated in the school curriculum.

The Bank's \$40 million basic education textbook development project in Uzbekistan supports curriculum reform and instructional materials development which will, among other things, help to strengthen the teaching of Uzbek culture and history. Uzbekistan has two World Heritage Sites and recently celebrated the 2500th anniversary of the founding of one of its ancient Silk Road cities--- the fabled Khiva. Basic education projects in many other countries are helping to develop citizens who are more knowledgeable about and sensitive to the importance of preserving their natural and cultural heritage.

This list could be extended for quite some time, but I think it is sufficient to convey the message that the Bank's strategic objectives and its lending and technical assistance activities support many of the same objectives promoted by the World Heritage Convention and the work of this Committee. I earlier asked how the Bank's work supports what you are trying to do. I hope this brief presentation of the Bank's strategic objectives and the very selective list of Bank-assisted activities has provided a clear answer: Yes, our objectives are often similar and our work is mutually reinforcing.

This meeting provides a rare occasion for the Bank to learn more about what you are doing and how you are doing it. We have a lot to learn from you, and I hope that our partnership will give you strength in a mutually reinforcing way in the years to come.

Thank you.

## PERIODIC REPORTING ON THE APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

### Format

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### SECTION I: APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION BY THE STATE PARTY

##### I.1. Introduction

- a. State Party
- b. Year of ratification or acceptance of the Convention
- c. Organization(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of the report
- d. Date of the report
- e. Signature on behalf of State Party

##### I.2. Identification of cultural and natural heritage properties

- a. National inventories
- b. Tentative List
- c. Nominations

##### I.3. Protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage

- a. General policy development
- b. Status of services for protection, conservation and presentation
- c. Scientific and technical studies and research
- d. Measures for identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation
- e. Training

##### I.4. International co-operation and fund raising

##### I.5. Education, information and awareness building

##### I.6. Conclusions and recommended action

- a. Main conclusions
- b. Proposed future action(s)
- c. Responsible implementing agency(ies)
- d. Timeframe for implementation
- e. Needs for international assistance.

#### SECTION II: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

##### II.1 Introduction

- a. State Party
- b. Name of World Heritage property
- c. Geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- d. Date of inscription on the World Heritage List
- e. Organization(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of the report
- f. Date of report
- g. Signature on behalf of State Party

##### II.2. Statement of significance

##### II.3. Statement of authenticity/integrity

##### II.4. Management

##### II.5. Factors affecting the property

##### II.6. Monitoring

##### II.7. Conclusions and recommended action

- a. Main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above)
- b. Main conclusions regarding the management and factors affecting the property (see Items II.4 and II.5. above)
- c. Proposed future action/actions
- d. Responsible implementing agency/agencies
- e. Timeframe for implementation
- f. Needs for international assistance.

## PERIODIC REPORTING ON THE APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

### Explanatory Notes

#### INTRODUCTION

(i) These Explanatory Notes are designed to provide guidance to those preparing periodic reports. They relate to the headings under which information is sought. Periodic reports should provide information under each of these headings. They should be signed by a responsible official on behalf of the State Party. These notes, particularly those referring to Section II of the periodic reports, are intended to be read in conjunction with the Explanatory Notes on the Format for the nomination of properties for inclusion on the World Heritage List that were adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its twentieth session. The nomination Format and the Explanatory Notes to it are available from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (document number WHC-97/WS/6 and on the UNESCO World Heritage Internet pages <http://www.unesco.org/whc/>).

#### Background

(ii) The twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO, held in 1997,

*Invited the States Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage to submit to it in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention, through the World Heritage Committee, via its Secretariat, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, reports on the legislative and administrative provisions they have adopted and other actions which they have taken for the application of the Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on their territories;*

*Requested the World Heritage Committee to define the periodicity, form, nature and extent of the periodic reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention and on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and to examine and respond to these reports in accordance with the principle of State sovereignty;*

*Requested the World Heritage Committee to include in its reports to the General Conference, submitted in accordance with Article 29.3 of the Convention, its findings with regard to the application of the Convention by the States Parties.*

(iii) The World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-second session held in 1998, adopted the Format and Explanatory Notes contained in this document and decided to:

(a) Invite States Parties to the World Heritage Convention to submit, in accordance with Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention and the decisions of the Eleventh General Assembly of States Parties and the 29<sup>th</sup> General Conference of UNESCO, periodic reports on the legislative and administrative provisions and other actions which they have taken for the application of the World Heritage Convention, including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on its territories ;

(b) Invite States Parties to submit periodic reports every six years using the Format for periodic reports as adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-second session ;

(c) Express its wish to examine the States Parties' periodic reports region by region. This will include the state of conservation of

properties inscribed on the World Heritage List according to the following table:

Region	Examination of properties inscribed up to and including	Year of Examination by Committee
Arab States	1992	2000
Africa	1993	2001
Asia and the Pacific	1994	2002
Latin America and the Caribbean	1995	2003
Europe and North America	1996/1997	2004/2005

Request the Secretariat, jointly with the Advisory Bodies, and making use of States Parties, competent institutions and expertise available within the region, to develop regional strategies for the periodic reporting process as per the time table established under (c) above. These strategies should respond to specific characteristics of the regions and should promote coordination and synchronization between States Parties, particularly in the case of transboundary properties.

#### Purpose of periodic reporting

(iv) The periodic reporting on the application of the World Heritage Convention is intended to serve four main purposes:

- to provide an assessment of the application of the World Heritage Convention by the State Party;
- to provide an assessment as to whether the World Heritage values of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List are being maintained over time;
- to provide up-dated information about the World Heritage properties to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the properties;
- to provide a mechanism for regional co-operation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the Convention and World Heritage conservation.

#### Format for periodic reports

(v) The Format for the periodic reports by the States Parties consists of two sections:

**Section I** refers to the legislative and administrative provisions which the State Party has adopted and other actions which it has taken for the application of the Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field. This particularly concerns the general obligations and commitments defined in specific articles of the Convention.

**Section II** refers to the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties located on the territory of the State Party concerned. This Section should be completed for each World Heritage property.

## General Requirements

- (vi) Information should be as precise and specific as possible. It should be quantified where possible and fully referenced.
- (vii) Information should be concise. In particular long historical accounts of sites and events which have taken place there should be avoided, especially when they can be found in readily available published sources.
- (viii) Expressions of opinion should be supported by reference to the authority on which they are made and the verifiable facts which support them.
- (ix) Periodic reports should be completed on A4 paper (210mm x 297mm) with maps and plans a maximum of A3 paper (297mm x 420mm). States Parties are also encouraged to submit the full text of the periodic reports in electronic form.

\*\*\*

## SECTION I: APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION BY THE STATE PARTY

(I.i) The *Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* was adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its seventeenth session on 16 November 1972. The World Heritage Committee, established under the World Heritage Convention, has prepared the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* which guide the work of the Committee in establishing the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, granting international assistance and treating other questions related to the implementation of the Convention.

(I.ii) In ratifying or accepting the World Heritage Convention, States Parties accept their duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage (Article 4) as defined in the Convention (Articles 1 and 2). These measures are further defined in several Articles in the Convention, e.g. Articles 5, 6, 11, 16, 17, 18, 27 and 28.

(I.iii) In Section I of the periodic report, States Parties are requested to “give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field” (Article 29.1 of the World Heritage Convention).

(I.iv) States Parties are invited to provide information under the following headings:

### I.1. Introduction

- a. State Party
- b. Year of ratification or acceptance of the Convention
- c. Organization(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of the report
- d. Date of the report
- e. Signature on behalf of State Party

### I.2. Identification of cultural and natural heritage properties

This item refers in particular to Articles 3, 4 and 11 of the Convention regarding the identification of cultural and natural heritage and the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List.

#### a. National inventories

Inventories of cultural and natural heritage of national significance form the basis for the identification of possible World Heritage properties. Indicate which institutions are in charge of the preparation and keeping up-to-date of these national inventories and if, and to what extent, inventories, lists and/or registers at the local, state and/or national level exist and have been completed.

#### b. Tentative List

Article 11 of the Convention refers to the submission by States Parties of inventories of property suitable for inclusion in the World Heritage List.

Provide the date of submission of the Tentative List or any revision made since its submission. States Parties are also encouraged to provide a description of the process of preparation and revision of the Tentative List, e.g. has(have) any particular institution(s) been assigned the responsibility for identifying and delineating World Heritage properties, have local authorities and local population been involved in its preparation? If so, provide exact details.

#### c. Nominations

List properties that have been nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List. States Parties are encouraged to provide an analysis of the process by which these nominations are prepared, the collaboration and co-operation with local authorities and people, the motivation, obstacles and difficulties encountered in that process and perceived benefits and lessons learnt.

### I.3. Protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage

This item refers in particular to Articles 4 and 5 of the Convention, in which States Parties recognise their duty of ensuring the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural World Heritage and that effective and active measures are taken to this effect. Article 5 of the Convention specifies the following measures:

#### a. General policy development

Provide information on the adoption of policies that aim to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community. Provide information on the way the State Party or the relevant authorities has(have) taken steps to integrate the protection of World Heritage properties into comprehensive planning programmes. Areas where improvement would be desirable, and towards which the State Party is working should be indicated.

**b. Status of services for protection, conservation and presentation**

Provide information on any services within the territories of the State Party which have been set up or have been substantially improved since the previous periodic report, if applicable. Particular attention should be given to services aiming at the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage, indicating the appropriate staff and the means to discharge their functions. Areas where improvement would be desirable, and towards which the State Party is working should be indicated.

**c. Scientific and technical studies and research**

List significant scientific and technical studies or research projects of a generic nature that would benefit World Heritage properties, initiated or completed since the last periodic report. Areas where improvement would be desirable, and towards which the State Party is working should be indicated.

Site specific scientific studies or research projects should be reported upon under Section II.4.

**d. Measures for identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation**

Indicate appropriate legal and administrative measures that the State Party or relevant authorities have taken for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of cultural and natural heritage. Particular attention should be given to measures concerning visitor management and development in the region. The State Party is also encouraged to indicate if, on the basis of the experiences gained, policy and/or legal reform is considered necessary. It is also relevant to note which other international conventions for the protection of cultural or natural heritage have been signed or ratified by the State Party and if so, how the application of these different legal instruments is co-ordinated and integrated in national policies and planning.

Indicate relevant scientific, and technical measures that the State Party or relevant institutions within the State have taken for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of cultural and natural heritage.

Indicate relevant financial measures that the State Party or relevant authorities have taken for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of cultural and natural heritage.

Information on the presentation of the heritage can refer to publications, internet web-pages, films, stamps, postcards, books etc.

Areas where improvement would be desirable, and towards which the State Party is working should be indicated.

**e. Training**

Provide information on the training and educational strategies that have been implemented within the State Party for professional capacity building, as well as on the establishment or development of national or regional centres for training and education in the protection, conservation, and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage, and the degree to which such

training has been integrated within existing university and educational systems.

Indicate the steps that the State has taken to encourage scientific research as a support to training and educational activities.

Areas where improvement would be desirable, and towards which the State Party is working should be indicated.

**I.4. International co-operation and fund raising**

This item refers particularly to Articles 4, 6, 17 and 18 of the Convention.

Provide information on the co-operation with other States Parties for the identification, protection, conservation and preservation of the World Heritage located on their territories.

Also indicate which measures have been taken to avoid damage directly or indirectly to the World Heritage on the territory of other States Parties.

Have national, public and private foundations or associations been established for, and has the State Party given assistance to, raising funds and donations for the protection of the World Heritage?

**I.5. Education, information and awareness building**

This item refers particularly to Articles 27 and 28 of the Convention on educational programmes.

Indicate steps that the State Party has taken to raise the awareness of decision-makers, property owners, and the general public about the protection and conservation of cultural and natural heritage.

Provide information on education (primary, secondary and tertiary) and information programmes that have been undertaken or are planned to strengthen appreciation and respect by the population, to keep the public broadly informed of the dangers threatening the heritage and of activities carried out in pursuance of the Convention. Does the State Party participate in the UNESCO Special Project *Young People's Participation in World Heritage Preservation and Promotion*?

Information on site-specific activities and programmes should be provided under item II.4 below.

**I.6. Conclusions and recommended action**

The main conclusions under each of the items of Section I of the report should be summarized and tabulated together with the proposed action(s) to be taken, the agency(ies) responsible for taking the action(s) and the timeframe for its execution:

- a. Main conclusions
- b. Proposed future action(s)
- c. Responsible implementing agency(ies)
- d. Timeframe for implementation
- e. Needs for international assistance

States Parties are also encouraged to provide in their first periodic report an analysis of the process by which they ratified

the Convention, the motivation, obstacles and difficulties encountered in that process and perceived benefits and lessons learnt.

\*\*\*

## **SECTION II: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

(II.i) The twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO, in its decision regarding the application of Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention, invited the States Parties to submit reports on the application of the World Heritage Convention, *including the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties located on their territories*.

(II.ii) The primary documents in respect of each World Heritage property are the nomination dossier as it was submitted by the State Party and the decision of the World Heritage Committee regarding the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

(II.iii) The preparation of periodic state of conservation reports should involve those who are responsible for the day-to-day management of the property. For trans-boundary properties it is recommended that reports be prepared jointly by or in close collaboration between the agencies concerned. The preparation of periodic state of conservation reports could include expert advice from the Secretariat and/or the Advisory Bodies, if and when the State Party(ies) concerned so wish(es).

(II.iv) The first periodic report should update the information provided in the original nomination dossier. Subsequent reports will then focus on any changes that may have occurred since the previous report was submitted.

This section of the periodic report follows, therefore, the format for the nomination dossier.

(II.v) The state of properties included in the List of World Heritage in Danger is reviewed by the World Heritage Committee at regular intervals, in general once every year. This review concentrates on the specific factors and considerations that led to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It will still be necessary to prepare a complete periodic report on the state of conservation of these properties.

(II.vi) This section should be completed for each individual World Heritage property. States Parties are invited to provide information under the following headings:

### **II.1. Introduction**

- a. State Party
- b. Name of World Heritage property
- c. Geographical coordinates to the nearest second
- d. Date of inscription on the World Heritage List
- e. Organization(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of the report
- f. Date of report
- g. Signature on behalf of State Party

### **II.2. Statement of Significance**

At the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee indicates its World Heritage values by deciding on the criteria for inscription. Please indicate the justification for inscription provided by the State Party, and the criteria under which the Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List.

In the view of the State Party, does the statement of significance adequately reflect the World Heritage values of the property or is a re-submission necessary? This could be considered, for example, to recognise cultural values of a natural World Heritage property, or vice-versa. This may become necessary either due to the substantive revision of the criteria by the World Heritage Committee or due to better identification or knowledge of specific outstanding universal values of the property.

Another issue that might be reviewed here is whether the delimitation of the World Heritage property, and its buffer zone if appropriate, is adequate to ensure the protection and conservation of the World Heritage values embodied in it. A revision or extension of the boundaries might be considered in response to such a review.

If a statement of significance is not available or incomplete, it will be necessary, in the first periodic report, for the State Party to propose such a statement. The statement of significance should reflect the criterion (criteria) on the basis of which the Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List. It should also address questions such as: What does the property represent, what makes the property outstanding, what are the specific values that distinguish the property, what is the relationship of the site with its setting, etc.? Such statement of significance will be examined by the Advisory Body(ies) concerned and transmitted to the World Heritage Committee for approval, if appropriate.

### **II.3. Statement of authenticity/integrity**

Under this item it is necessary to review whether the values on the basis of which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, and reflected in the statement of significance under item II.2 above, are being maintained.

This should also include the issue of authenticity/integrity in relation to the property. What was the evaluation of the authenticity/integrity of the property at the time of inscription? What is the authenticity/integrity of the property at present?

Please note that a more detailed analysis of the conditions of the property is required under item II.6 on the basis of key indicators for measuring its state of conservation.

### **II.4. Management**

Under this item, it is necessary to report on the implementation and effectiveness of protective legislation at the national, provincial or municipal level and/or contractual or traditional protection as well as of management and/or planning control for the property concerned, as well as on actions that are foreseen for the future, to preserve the values described in the statement of significance under item II.2.

The State Party should also report on significant changes in the ownership, legal status and/or contractual or traditional protective measures, management arrangements and management plans as compared to the situation at the time of inscription or the previous periodic report. In such case, the State Party is requested to attach to the periodic report all relevant documentation, in particular legal texts, management plans and/or (annual) work plans for the management and maintenance of the property. Full name and address of the agency or person directly responsible for the property should also be provided.

The State Party could also provide an assessment of the human and financial resources that are available and required for the management of the property, as well as an assessment of the training needs for its staff.

The State Party is also invited to provide information on scientific studies, research projects, education, information and awareness building activities directly related to the property and to comment on the degree to which heritage values of the property are effectively communicated to residents, visitors and the public. Matters that could be addressed are, among other things: is there a plaque at the site indicating that the property is a World Heritage property? Are there educational programmes for schools? Are there special events and exhibitions? What facilities, visitor centre, site museum, trails, guides, information material etc. are made available to visitors? What role does the World Heritage designation play in all these programmes and activities?

Furthermore, the State Party is invited to provide statistical information, if possible on an annual basis, on income, visitor numbers, staff and other items if appropriate.

On the basis of the review of the management of the property, the State Party may wish to consider if a substantive revision of the legislative and administrative provisions for the conservation of the property is required.

## **II.5. Factors affecting the property**

Please comment on the degree to which the property is threatened by particular problems and risks. Factors that could be considered under this item are those that are listed in the nomination format, e.g. development pressure, environmental pressure, natural disasters and preparedness, visitor/tourism pressure, number of inhabitants.

Considering the importance of forward planning and risk preparedness, provide relevant information on operating methods that will make the State Party capable of counteracting dangers that threaten or may endanger its cultural or natural heritage. Problems and risks to be considered could include earthquakes, floods, land-slides, vibrations, industrial pollution, vandalism, theft, looting, changes in the physical context of properties, mining, deforestation, poaching, as well as changes in land-use, agriculture, road building, construction activities, tourism. Areas where improvement would be desirable, and towards which the State Party is working should be indicated.

This item should provide up-to-date information on all factors which are likely to affect or threaten the property. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them.

An assessment should also be given if the impact of these factors on the property is increasing or decreasing and what actions to

address them have been effectively taken or are planned for the future.

## **II.6. Monitoring**

Whereas item II.3 of the periodic report provides an overall assessment of the maintenance of the World Heritage values of the property, this item analyses in more detail the conditions of the property on the basis of key indicators for measuring its state of conservation.

If no indicators were identified at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, this should be done in the first periodic report. The preparation of a periodic report can also be an opportunity to evaluate the validity of earlier identified indicators and to revise them, if necessary.

Up-to-date information should be provided in respect of each of the key indicators. Care should be taken to ensure that this information is as accurate and reliable as possible, for example by carrying out observations in the same way, using similar equipment and methods at the same time of the year and day.

Indicate which partners if any are involved in monitoring and describe what improvement the State Party foresees or would consider desirable in improving the monitoring system.

In specific cases, the World Heritage Committee and/or its Bureau may have already examined the state of conservation of the property and made recommendations to the State Party, either at the time of inscription or afterwards. In such cases the State Party is requested to report on the actions that have been taken in response to the observations or recommendations made by the Bureau or Committee.

## **II.7. Summary of conclusions and recommended actions**

The main conclusions under each of the items of the state of conservation report, but in particular as to whether the World Heritage values of the property are maintained, should be summarized and tabulated together with:

- a. Main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above)
- b. Main conclusions regarding the management and factors affecting the property (see Items II.4 and II.5. above)
- c. Proposed future action/actions
- d. Responsible implementing agency/agencies
- e. Timeframe for implementation
- f. Needs for international assistance

The State Party is also requested to indicate what experience the State Party has obtained which could be relevant to others dealing with similar problems or issues. Please provide names of organizations or specialists who could be contacted for this purpose.

## **Decisions of the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee (Kyoto, 28-29 November 1998) with regard to the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, noted by the Committee \***

### **NATURAL HERITAGE**

#### **Great Barrier Reef (Australia)**

The Bureau at its twenty-first extraordinary session requested the Australian authorities to provide specific information on the results of the financial review of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA). At its twenty-second session, (June, 1998) the Bureau was informed that the Australian authorities have set rigorous environmental conditions on development activities in the Hinchinbrook region, and have implemented several other measures to strengthen the conservation of the Great Barrier Reef. Since then, the Australian authorities have informed the Centre that they have acted on the findings of the financial review. In accordance with the review's key recommendations, the Australian Government has reorganized the GBRMPA to assist the Authority to meet critical challenges in protecting and managing the Great Barrier Reef. The Bureau noted that the Australian authorities are unable to provide the Centre with a copy of the financial review of the GBRMPA since it is considered an internal working document of the Government.

The Bureau was informed that IUCN has received reports on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, GBRMPA and the Australian NGOs and it is in the process of reviewing all those reports.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the reports from IUCN Australia and the Australian NGOs to the State Party for review and comments. Furthermore, the Bureau recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

#### **Heard and McDonald Islands (Australia)**

The Committee, when it inscribed this property on the World Heritage at its last session (Naples, 1997), had requested documentation on the marine resources surrounding this property. The Australian authorities have informed the Centre that the Australian Antarctic Division has recently granted Commonwealth funding to collate and analyse existing data on the benthic environments surrounding this property, including the territorial sea. In accordance with Australia's plans to establish a marine protected area in the region, the project aims to assess whether the 12 nautical miles territorial sea provides a representative sample of marine biodiversity in the region. To enable such an assessment, a comprehensive research programme will be undertaken to clearly identify the marine values of the area. A report on the project is expected within six months.

The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a report, before 15 April 1999, on the findings of the project to establish a marine

protected area so as to enable it to review the report at its twenty-third session in 1999.

#### **Shark Bay, Western Australia (Australia)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a petroleum exploration permit had been granted by the State Government of West Australia (WA) for an area located within the World Heritage site. The Observer of Australia assured the Bureau that no development that threatens the World Heritage values of the site would be allowed to take place. IUCN however, voiced its concern about the issue of the granting of prospecting licences by State Governments of WA, and Queensland for locations within World Heritage areas, and called for closer liaison between Commonwealth and State Governments on this matter.

Since the conclusion of the Bureau session in June 1998, the State Party has provided a detailed report describing the administrative structure established, and the resources committed for the conservation of this property. In addition, the Australian authorities have informed the Centre that a mining lease of the Shark Bay Salt Joint Venture (SBSJV) had attracted public comment but is outside of the property and that levee construction occurred outside the World Heritage area. The levee is 5.6 km long and was constructed across Useless Inlet to enclose 2,600 ha of marine waters, adjacent to SBSJV's existing primary concentration pond, and as part of the expansion of the company's operations. Approval for the levee construction was granted under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act of 1986 and construction works complied with the environmental requirements set by the Minister for the Environment. The WA Department of Environment conducted two environmental compliance audits and concluded that SBSJV had satisfactorily implemented environmental conditions during the construction phase. Furthermore, in accordance with a post-construction environmental requirement, marine mega-fauna, namely 13 bottlenose dolphins, six loggerhead turtles and 23 green turtles, which were trapped behind the levee, were transferred to open marine waters by SBSJV with the help of professional assistance provided by the Department of Conservation and Land Management.

The Bureau was informed that IUCN has received a report on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, and that it is in the process of reviewing that report.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from IUCN Australia to the State Party for review. The Bureau furthermore recommended that IUCN provides an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

\* See also paragraphs VII.27, VII.30 and VII.43 of this report.



### **Wet Tropics of Queensland (Australia)**

The Bureau, at its twenty-second session (June, 1998) learnt that the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment had investigated concerns that vegetation clearing may have occurred within this property and determined that World Heritage values were not at risk and that no further action was needed on this matter. Since then the Australian authorities have re-affirmed that the arrangements for the management of this site are now fully effective and meet with the full confidence of their Government. They have pointed out that the Management Plan, effective as of 1 September 1998, had been prepared with the full involvement of all stakeholders, including Aboriginal groups. The Plan provides the Wet Tropics Management Authority with a full suite of powers to act in the interests of the World Heritage values of the property.

IUCN informed the Bureau that it had received a report on the state of conservation of this site from its Australian National Committee, and that it is in the process of reviewing that report.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from IUCN Australia to the State Party for review. The Bureau furthermore recommended that IUCN provide an up-to-date state of conservation report on this site for the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

### **Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland)**

The Bureau at its twenty-first extraordinary session was informed that sustainable forestry operations in the Polish side of this trans-border site were restricted to forests outside of the World Heritage area. The Bureau had invited the Polish authorities to inform the Centre as to whether they plan to extend the World Heritage area to conform to the new boundaries of the 10,500 ha Bialowieza National Park, as established in 1996.

The Polish authorities submitted, on 10 September 1998, an extension of the Bialowieza Forest. The proposed extension is substantial and will be evaluated by IUCN in 1999 in accordance with paragraph 64 of the Operational Guidelines and recommendations submitted to the twenty-third ordinary session of the Bureau. The Bureau noted the publication entitled "Belovezhskaya Pushcha Forest Biodiversity Conservation" produced by the Belarus authorities which focuses on strengthening forest and wildlife conservation and improving land-use management. The publication is based on results of the "Belarus Forest Biodiversity Protection Project" financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The Bureau commended the Polish authorities for nominating an extension to their part of the World Heritage site. The Bureau reiterated its previous request that the two States Parties co-operate to prepare a management plan for the Belarus part and consider removing the fence separating the two parts.

### **Iguacu National Park (Brazil)**

Since 1997, the Bureau and the Committee have repeatedly called for the permanent closure of the 18 km road traversing this Park which had been illegally opened by local people. The Bureau, at its twenty-second session (June, 1998) requested the Centre and IUCN to undertake a joint mission to review the situation and to assist the State Party to mitigate the threats to the Park and asked the State Party to provide by 15 September 1998: (i) a copy of the revitalisation programme and a time

frame for the rehabilitation of damaged areas; and (ii) a detailed report on the state of conservation of the site and actions taken with regard to the permanent closure of the road.

The Bureau was informed of a new threat to Iguacu's integrity, arising from plans to fill a hydropower reservoir in Southwest Brazil that would divert a considerable volume of Iguacu's waters for seven to eight weeks every year.

The Bureau reiterated its request that the State Party provide information on items (i) and (ii) as described above and on plans to divert Iguacu's waters to fill a hydropower reservoir in Southwest Brazil. The Bureau also noted that a Centre/IUCN mission to the site could be scheduled in March 1999 in order to determine whether the site needs to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon)**

The Committee, at its twenty-first session, had expressed its concern that logging activities, carried out under commercial, as well as sustainable forestry schemes, are contributing to the growing biological isolation of the Reserve and are not welcome by local people. At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau noted the findings and recommendations of the Regional Training Workshop, organized with the support of a US\$ 29,900 grant from the World Heritage Fund. It suggested that Cameroon take urgent measures to act on the Workshop recommendations and present to the twenty-second session of the Committee, a statement of actions to be implemented, particularly in order to:

- (a) strengthen law enforcement against poaching and improve management of hunting and trade in wildlife products; and
- (b) halt the issue of new licences for forest exploitation in areas immediately adjacent to the boundaries of the World Heritage site.

The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate in designing and launching a rapid bio-diversity assessment to evaluate the impacts of on-going forestry activities on the contiguity of habitats and gene pools in and around the Dja World Heritage site. The Centre is currently discussing possible financial support for such a study with UNDP, Cameroon, and bilateral donors, such as the Netherlands.

The Bureau was informed that the Cameroon authorities have implemented some of the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop; e.g. establishment of an inter-ministerial and a multidisciplinary working group, strengthening of infrastructure and the launching of a programme to build environmental awareness among local communities. However, the Bureau noted that further actions are needed for the implementation of all of the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop.

The Bureau invited the State Party to provide a report by 15 September 1999 concerning progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the Sangmelima Workshop. Based on the review of such a report, the Committee, at its twenty-third session, may consider calling for a Centre/IUCN mission in the year 2000, possibly in co-operation with other international partners.

### **Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada)**

At its twenty-first session, the Committee expressed its serious concerns over the potential threats posed by the Cheviot Mine Project, designed to exploit a large, open-pit coal mine, located 2.8 km from the Jasper National Park portion of this site. A case filed by conservation groups challenging the EIA of the Federal-Provincial Environment Assessment Panel in favour of the mining project was dismissed because the judge decided that the Panel report is not subject to judicial review. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau had requested the State Party to provide a status report on the proposed mining project, including information on any proposed start-up date for the project. The Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks Canada, via his letter of 15 September 1998, has informed the Centre that it is unlikely that construction work on any component of the mine will begin before the spring of 1999. On 27 August 1998, the Government of Alberta announced the creation of Whitehorse Wildland Park between Jasper National Park and the proposed mine, to help protect the ecological integrity of Jasper National Park and its surrounding area.

The Bureau reiterated its concerns over the impacts of the proposed Cheviot mining project on the integrity of the site and is pleased to be informed that other alternatives may be considered. The Bureau welcomed the initiative of the Government of Alberta to establish the new Whitehorse Wildland Park to improve the ecological integrity of the Jasper National Park and its surrounding areas. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide the Centre and IUCN with an up-date for the proposed mining project and provide a status report on the project to the Centre, before 15 April 1999, for review at its twenty-third session.

### **Jiuzhaigou Valley Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)**

The Bureau was informed of the findings of a Centre/IUCN mission to this site undertaken in September 1998. The mission found that the management authorities of this site has been effective in restricting hotel construction to areas outside of the property. Within the site, visitors have no option other than staying in small-scale tourist facilities established in the homes of the Tibetan villagers resident there. The mission found that the management authorities and the local people have entered into an effective partnership, material and social conditions of the villagers have considerably improved, and economic benefits accrued through tourism has eliminated the need for natural resources exploitation. The State Council of China has issued a directive to completely halt illegal logging in the site. Despite these positive features, the mission team found the site to be congested with tourists; the management has made it too easy for the visitors to enter the site en-masse and in vehicles that drive through the core area. Increasing visitation appears to be leading to mushrooming of several new hotels immediately outside the boundaries of the site.

The Bureau commended the Chinese authorities for their effective management of the site and encouraged them to establish a "park-and-drive" system and to limit travel within the site to smaller, environment-friendly vehicles. Visitors should be accompanied by trained guides who have the capacity to interpret the natural and World Heritage values of the site. The Bureau drew the attention of the Chinese authorities to the need to improve training of site staff so that they can better monitor and mitigate tourism impacts on the site. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities.

### **Huanglong Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)**

The Bureau was informed of the findings of a Centre/IUCN mission to this site in September 1998 that was favourably impressed with tourism management there. The site is located within the same Minshan Mountain range as the Jiuzhaigou World Heritage area described above. Tourist accommodation facilities in Huanglonggou are limited and future development of facilities is being confined to the town of Chuan Zhu Si, in Songpan County, 40 km from the Huanglong World Heritage area. The 7km boardwalk within the site is well managed and a visitor centre is currently under construction at Huanglonggou.

The mission team urged the Chinese authorities to implement the recommendation of the Committee, made at the time of inscription of this site and Jiuzhaigou in 1992, to link the two sites into a single Minshan Mountain World Heritage Area. The Bureau learned that the Chinese authorities had pointed out the need for undertaking scientific studies to link the two sites into a single World Heritage area nomination and the difficulties in co-ordination between two different County administrations. After the mission team had provided information on cluster nominations submitted by other States Parties, the Chinese authorities expressed an interest in taking the necessary steps to implement the Committee's 1992 recommendation. The mission also urged the Chinese authorities to explore possibilities for linking the Jiuzhaigou-Huanglong cluster with a selected number of reserves set aside for the protection of the giant panda in Sichuan.

The Bureau commended the State Party for effectively managing tourism in Huanglong. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to undertake necessary studies for preparing a Minshan Mountain Range World Heritage area nomination linking Jiuzhaigou and Huanglong World Heritage sites and other giant panda reserves as appropriate. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities.

### **Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China)**

The Bureau was informed of the findings of a Centre/IUCN mission to this site in September 1998. The mission found this site to be overrun with tourist facilities, having a considerable impact on the aesthetic qualities of the site. The Chinese authorities have not taken any steps to implement the recommendation of the Committee, made at the time of the site's inscription in 1992, to prepare a species status conservation report in order to determine whether the site would qualify for inscription under natural heritage criterion (iv). At present the site is inscribed under natural heritage criterion (iii) only. The mission found that several buildings and roads have been damaged as this site has been severely impacted by the recent floods in China. The site management has been encouraged to consider submitting a plan for rehabilitation of damaged areas within the site and a financial assistance request to the World Heritage Fund for emergency assistance. The site requires enhanced support from the Central and Provincial Governments of China owing to its location in a relatively remote region with a poorly developed economy.

The Bureau invited the Provincial and Central Government authorities to augment the resources for the management of the site. Co-operation with the Chinese Academy of Sciences and other such institutions may be needed in order to assess the World Heritage values of the site's biodiversity. The Bureau

drew the attention of the State Party to manage tourism development in and around the site on a sustainable basis. Furthermore, the Bureau urged the State Party to assess the extent of damage caused to the site by the recent floods and prepare a rehabilitation plan for implementation with financial support from Provincial and Central Governments, the World Heritage Fund and other sources. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities.

#### **Los Katios National Park (Colombia)**

In November 1997, a representative of Colombia's Ministry of Environment informed IUCN that the security situation in this site was threatened by conflicts between armed groups. A significant portion of the Park area was off-limit to staff due to the presence of such armed groups and tourism to the area had come to a halt. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau requested IUCN to review a report submitted by the Colombian authorities to the Centre and submit its findings to the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau. The Bureau was informed that a major restructuring of Colombia's conservation administration was currently underway, for devolving responsibilities for the management of Los Katios to the provincial level. On 24 September 1998, the Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO confirmed this fact. IUCN has been gathering further information on the decentralisation process to assess its implications for the conservation of Los Katios, but was of the view that the site is under serious threat and should be considered for inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed of a new report submitted by the Colombian authorities on 23 November 1998. This report notes that the Park was affected by the confrontation between guerrilla and paramilitary groups and during that time four sectors of the Park received only limited attention from the authorities. In 1997 and 1998, however, a number of activities were carried out, including the strengthening of the protection of the Park through control units, inter-institutional meetings, collaboration with communities living in the Park, work on the definition of the buffer zone of the Park and the elaboration of the management plan. Support for the creation and consolidation of the Darien Special Management Area (DSMA) to co-ordinate the management of the two World Heritage sites (Darien of Panama and Los Katios of Colombia) has been provided and actions will be taken to create a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. In addition, a number of meetings of the Bi-national Commission of Colombia and Panama took place and a US\$ 500,000 project for a rapid ecological evaluation of the area, funded by the Mac Arthur Foundation, is being implemented by the NGOs from both countries.

The Colombian authorities have concluded that although there have been impacts on the Park, it had not been invaded by colonists and the pressure on the Park and its natural resources had reduced considerably. Preventive measures have been taken for the security of the personnel and the Park has returned to a certain normality and calm, allowing the staff to control the area and to implement operations. The State Party does not see any need for inclusion of Los Katios on the List of World Heritage in Danger at present.

The Bureau took note of the report provided by the Colombian authorities. It requested the Centre and IUCN to keep in contact with the State Party to monitor progress made and to report back to the twenty-third session of the Bureau. The Bureau

commended the Mac Arthur Foundation for its support for a conservation project in the "Darien Gap Region". The Bureau reiterated the Committee's recommendation made at the time of the inscription of the site to establish a single World Heritage site linking Darien (Panama) and Los Katios (Colombia) World Heritage sites.

#### **Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed of a cable car construction project through the centre of this Park, proposed by a private individual concerned with tourism development. The feasibility of the project is questionable due to the heavy rains, high winds and the steep-terrain that characterises this site. The construction of major access facilities in this area is not consistent with the management plan of the Park, and the Bureau was in agreement with IUCN that the Dominica authorities need to exercise great caution when evaluating the feasibility of this proposal. The Director of the Centre visited the site during his participation in the International Conference on the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Caribbean (2-5 August 1998). He observed that the project foresees the "sky-train", taking visitors to the heart of the core area and was of the view that the proposed project is unlikely to be compatible with Dominica's obligations under the Convention for conservation of this site. The Government of Dominica, via its letter of 7 July 1998, informed the Centre that the terms of reference for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the proposal have been prepared and reviewed by the Natural Resource Management Unit of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. The terms of reference have also been forwarded to the proponent of the cable way system. The Government informed the Centre that the report of the EIA would be submitted to the Centre for review as soon as it is available.

The Bureau noted that the State Party is carrying out an EIA on the cable car construction project. The Bureau drew the attention of the State Party to IUCN's view that the location foreseen for the cable car construction would be inappropriate and inconsistent with the management plan. The Bureau invited Dominica to submit a report on the outcome of the EIA and the status of the cable car development proposal before 15 April 1999.

#### **Nanda Devi National Park (India)**

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau noted that the management of this site is based on enforcing a policy of strict protection. An Indian Supreme Court ruling of 1996 suspended, until further review by concerned authorities, rights of the local people to collect forest produce in protected areas, including in their buffer zones. This ruling has been applied to the "Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve", including in its buffer zone surrounding the Nanda Devi National Park and World Heritage area. The enactment of the Supreme Court ruling has led to a rise in conflicts between the management and local people. Co-ordination between the Ministry of Tourism and site management also needs to be improved; site-staff had to apprehend tourists who had entered the Park with permits issued by tourism authorities without informing site management. Furthermore, the Deputy Director of the Park was of the view that the boundaries of the World Heritage site could be extended to include the Valley of Flowers National Park and the Khedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary.

The Bureau invited the State Party to review site management policy with a view to minimising conflicts between management and local people and to seek the co-operation of local people in the protection of the site. Co-operation between conservation and tourism authorities also needs to be strengthened in order to define a policy for visitor entry and use of the site. The Bureau suggested that the Indian authorities study the feasibility for enlarging the World Heritage area by including the Valley of Flowers National Park and the Khedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary.

#### **Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno (Mexico)**

The Bureau recalled that during 1996-97, the State Party, by establishing a Scientific Committee which set up stringent environmental conditions on the proponents of an industrial salt production facility, successfully averted threats which the construction of that facility could have posed to the integrity of this site. However, the Bureau was informed that IUCN and the Centre have received a large number of messages about threats to this site arising from a renewed consideration of the project for constructing an industrial salt production facility. Several of these messages include calls for declaring El Viscaïno a World Heritage site in Danger. Moreover, IUCN has pointed out that new settlements are occurring in the area; increasing pollution and over-fishing are crowding out endangered and endemic species. There are indications of a decline in the populations of various marine mammals, shellfish, and sea turtles that are unique to the area. IUCN has recommended that a mission to the site be planned in 1999 to evaluate various threats to the integrity of the site and assess whether or not this site should be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Bureau was informed that a report had been received on 26 November 1998 and that IUCN and the Centre were not able to review this new information; however, the summary of that report indicates that the Government does not consider the site to be in Danger.

The Observer of Mexico informed the Bureau that it was the Mexican Environmental Agency (SEMARNAP) which established an International Scientific Committee that set up stringent guidelines for the environmental impact assessment for a salt production facility. He stated that there are no indications of a decline in the populations of various mammals, shellfish or sea turtles in the area.

The Observer of Mexico also informed the Bureau that the El Viscaïno Lagoons are not in danger and that Mexico has a strong environmental legal framework, which regulates any activities in the site. His Government continues to take actions to reinforce environmental regulations to preserve the marine resources of the site and in particular, that the management programme has been concluded and that the reserve is included in the GEF programme for ten Mexican priority areas. He furthermore informed the Bureau that the grey whale population is recovering and that it has not been affected by the salt extraction. The Mexican Government has not authorised any construction project or extension of the salt production facility. The International Scientific Committee will review the EIA as soon as it is completed. This assessment will be essential for the final decision. In conclusion, the Mexican Government states that the site is not in danger, no proposal will be authorised which would jeopardise conservation of the site and that the World Heritage values will be conserved. In accordance with Article 11, par.4 of the Convention, there is no reason to include the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. He indicated

that an invitation of his Government to carry out a mission would be provided.

The Bureau noted that the State Party has provided new information and requested the Centre to transmit it to IUCN for review. The Bureau was pleased to note that the State Party, upon receipt of IUCN's comments on the report would invite a mission to the site as soon as possible. The Bureau requested that the mission should prepare an up-to-date state of conservation report on the Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaïno, and submit it to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

#### **Royal Chitwan National Park (Nepal)**

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau noted this site's success in conserving the great one-horned rhinoceros. The Park celebrated its 25<sup>th</sup> year anniversary in 1998. However, the management of the Park is faced with problems of pollution of the Narayani River due to industrial sewage discharged into that River by private enterprises located outside the Park. An increase in the natural rate of mortality of the rhinoceros in 1998 remains unexplained and is perhaps attributable to the possibility that the population consists of a considerable number of older individuals. The National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act has been recently amended to ensure that 30-50% of the tourism revenues from the Park are used for development projects benefiting local communities. The Bureau was informed of the interest of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation of Nepal to use the large volume of scientific data available on ecological and managerial aspects of Royal Chitwan for setting up a systematic monitoring regime for the Park.

The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN co-operate with the State Party to design and implement international assistance projects for mitigating the impacts of the pollution of the Narayani River. The Bureau urged the Centre and IUCN-Nepal to co-operate with the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation to establish a systematic monitoring scheme for tracking long-term changes in the ecology, and the management regime of Royal Chitwan.

#### **Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal)**

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau noted that supplying the energy needs of the growing number of tourists, staff and the Sherpa community is the most critical management issue in this site. At present, site staff and a considerable number of the Sherpa families resident in lower elevations have shifted to the use of kerosene and micro-power plants to meet their energy needs. However, tourist installations in the higher alpine zones continue to exploit the juniper bushes to meet their fuel-wood needs. The site management is initiating a project for which the Chairperson, based on a request submitted by the State Party, approved a sum of US\$ 15,000 from the Fund, to update information-displays at the interpretation Centre at the Park entrance and in the Namche Bazar Visitor Centre. New displays are to be designed in order to inform visitors of the growing energy demands of the tourist industry and to suggest possible ways and means by which tourists could help the management to find solutions. Restrictions to the number of visitors to the Park is likely to be resisted by the Sherpa community who derive about 75% of their income from tourism; at least one member of each Sherpa household is employed in the tourism industry. The site management intends to start a process for revising the management plan of the site, in connection with the commemoration of the site's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2001. As part of

that process detailed analyses of trends in the growth in the numbers of visitors and local population and associated energy demands will be undertaken.

IUCN informed the Bureau about a seminar held on the Impacts of Tourism Development on Sagarmatha in August 1998. A research project to revise the management plan, prepare a tourism development strategy and undertake relevant training is also under consideration by protected landscape and development agencies of the United Kingdom.

The Bureau encouraged the State Party to seek a long-term, strategic approach for managing the increase in the growth of the numbers of visitors and local people and the parallel rise in energy demands. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN Nepal to co-operate with the State Party and the relevant agencies of the United Kingdom to ensure that visitor rates, tourism infrastructure development and energy demand planning become an integral part of the process to revise the site's management plan in connection with the commemoration of Sagarmatha's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2001.

#### **Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman)**

In 1997, the authorities of Oman submitted an interim zoning plan that foresaw a new outer boundary, and provisional boundaries for five management zones. In addition, they provided brief descriptions of their plans for implementing several projects and a report on the population status of the Arabian Oryx in the Sanctuary.

At its twenty-second session (June 1998), the Bureau agreed with IUCN's position that it would be better to review the zoning plan and other associated proposals after the overall management plan and the boundaries for the site are finalised. Hence, the Bureau invited the State Party to inform the Centre about progress with regard to the finalisation of the management plan and submit the plan to IUCN and the Centre for review. The Centre informed the Bureau that no response from the authorities of Oman has been received.

The Bureau noted with concern that the boundaries of the site remained undefined since the inscription of the site in 1994. The Bureau requested the Oman authorities to expedite the finalisation of the management plan, including the boundaries of the site and its management zones. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit the finalised plan for review by IUCN and the Centre before 15 September 1999. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to submit the findings of their review of the management plan to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

#### **Huascarán National Park (Peru)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a Canadian/Peruvian mining consortium is in the final stages of obtaining approval to develop one of the world's largest copper and zinc deposits found at Antamina, located 20km east of this Park. Mining is expected to commence in 2001 and have a life span of 20 years. The Bureau noted that the concentrates may be transported from the mining site to the coast, either via a Central Road that traverses the Park, or an alternative Southern Road circling around the Park. The mining company had agreed to take the Southern Road, which is completely outside the Park, but traverses the buffer zones of the Huascarán World Heritage site and the Biosphere Reserve. No EIA has been carried out for the use of the Southern Road so far. The Central Road would

however, be used for bringing heavy equipment to the mining area for approximately one year, until the construction of a bypass along the Southern Road is completed to allow for the transport of such heavy equipment along that road. IUCN underlined the importance of monitoring all impacts of the use of the Central Road during the one-year period. The Bureau took note of the different options for accessing the mining area and the preference expressed by INRENA to use the Southern Road. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to collaborate with the State Party to control impacts of the temporary use of the Central Road through the Park until the Southern Road becomes fully operational. The Bureau suggested that a future mission to this site may be useful, and requested the State Party to provide a status report on the mining project to its twenty-second extraordinary session. The Bureau recommended that the State Party consider inviting a Representative of IUCN to be part of the "Working Group" being established by INRENA on the management of the site.

The Bureau agreed with the proposal of the Chairperson to establish a *Study Group* to reconcile environment and development needs and to use Huascarán as a case study which could provide guidance and lessons to other World Heritage sites whose integrity is threatened by potential mining projects. The Centre has proposed names of a number of experts, who may be included in the *Study Group* to be established for the consideration of the Chairperson. The Centre and IUCN had been invited by the International Council on Metals and the Environment (ICME) to a working session on "Mining and Protected Areas and other Ecologically Sensitive Sites" on 20 October 1998 in London, UK.

On 14 September 1998, INRENA informed the Centre that several meetings regarding the establishment of the "Working Group" on the management of the site were held. Representatives from the IUCN Office in Peru participated in the INRENA meetings. On 28 September 1998, additional information on the state of conservation of Huascarán National Park and the Huascarán Biosphere Reserve was submitted by the Permanent Delegation of Peru to UNESCO to the Centre. In addition, the Centre informed the Bureau that INRENA provided an update on the situation on 20 November 1998, indicating that the "Working Group" on the management of the site, (in particular to oversee the use of the Central Road) has been established. A meeting of the Working Group was held on 13 November 1998 with INRENA, IUCN Peru, MAB, Mountain Institute, Ministry for Energy and Mining and members of the consortium on "Mining, conservation and sustainable development". The Group will work independently from the Antamina Mining Company and will invite local participation. Antamina confirmed to complete the construction of the bypass along the Southern Road by July 1999, provide traffic estimates and expressed an interest in the use of the Central and Northern Roads for vehicles transporting personnel. It also committed itself to road maintenance and reaffirmed its support to the Park. An up-to-date report by Antamina was also provided concerning the agreement with the Government of Peru concluded on 16 September 1998 to develop the Antamina project. This project will create 4,000 jobs during the construction and 1,000 jobs during the twenty years of the mine. Antamina will provide information on the use of the Central Road including an addendum to the EIA, and the revised mine plan with rearrangements of waste storage.

The Bureau commended the Government of Peru regarding actions taken to implement the recommendation of the Bureau to establish a Working Group on the management of the site and to

control impacts of the temporary use of the Central Road through the Park until the Southern Road becomes fully operational. However, the Bureau expressed concern over the permanent use of the Central and Northern Road for the transport of the mine personnel. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a copy of the additional EIA on the impacts of the use of the Central Road and the Northern Road to the Centre and IUCN and to provide a status report on the project by 15 April 1999.

Concerning the *Study Group*, the Chairperson pointed out that his intention was not to create a permanent group, which would involve financial costs. He suggested that a small and informal contact group during World Heritage Committee and Bureau meetings might be established. This suggestion was supported by a number of Bureau members. The Centre and IUCN informed the Bureau that a dialogue with the mining industry has commenced. IUCN's World's Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) has prepared a "Draft policy on mining and protected areas" which is currently being reviewed within the WCPA network and that consultations with UNESCO's Division for Earth Sciences and the International Union for Geological Sciences have been undertaken. The Bureau requested that the Draft policy document be circulated prior to the next session of the Bureau. ICOMOS stressed the need to review impacts of mining on cultural sites as well.

#### **Kamchatka Volcanoes (Russian Federation)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau recalled that a proposed mining project, located at about 5 km outside of the Bystrinsky portion of this site, if executed would disrupt migratory wildlife in the region and impact fisheries resources. The Bureau was informed of communications from the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation and the Governor of the Province of Kamchatka reiterating their commitment to the site's protection. The Governor of Kamchatka supported the controlled development of the Aginskoe gold deposit and pointed out that a formal EIA of the mining project had been carried out. Nevertheless, the Bureau expressed its concern to the Russian Government and the Kamchatka Administration over the potential consequences of the proposed mine, and requested the Centre to obtain more information, particularly on details of the EIA carried out.

Since the conclusion of the last session of the Bureau in June 1998, IUCN has informed the Centre that a GEF-funded project for this site could significantly strengthen biodiversity conservation in the area and that WWF has also initiated projects for the conservation of the site. Furthermore, IUCN was informed by the Kamchatka authorities that they intend to extend the World Heritage area by including an additional volcano within the region; IUCN has recommended that the Bureau encourage the State Party to proceed with their plans to extend the World Heritage area.

The Centre informed the Bureau that a letter, dated 17 November 1998, from the State Committee for the Environment indicates that there would be no impact on the World Heritage area as the gold deposit would be outside the Bystrinsky park. The Governor of Kamchatka, in his letter of 4 November 1998, underlined that the Aginskoe Gold Mining project is subject to rigid environmental requirements by the Kamchatka Province. Following the IUCN mission in 1997 indicating that the mine would not be visible from the site and would not affect any drainage system, the Governor came to the conclusion that the

mine could start subject to the fact that it meets all environmental conditions.

The Bureau noted the activities of GEF and WWF for the conservation of Kamchatka. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN maintain contact with the State Party and the Kamchatka Administration in order to obtain detailed information on the EIA carried out, and to systematically monitor the status of the proposed gold mining project. The Bureau welcomed the possibility that the Kamchatka authorities may be considering extension of the area of the site to include another volcano within the region and encourages the State Party to proceed with such plans in consultation with the Centre and IUCN.

#### **Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)**

At its twenty-first extraordinary session, the Bureau had expressed its serious concerns over a proposed gold mining project in this site and requested detailed information on the project, including any environmental impact studies that may have been carried out. At its twenty-second session, the Bureau noted that letters from different Federal and State Level authorities seem to imply that changes to the boundaries of the World Heritage site were under consideration and that the gold mining project may have been suspended. Hence, the Bureau urged the State Party to provide to the Centre, full information on any proposal to change the borders of the site, and confirm whether the gold mining project had been withdrawn.

IUCN has informed the Centre that following a Federal Government inspection of the site in the context of the proposed gold mining activities, the local authorities were ordered to cancel all activities related to mining. However, the Government of the Komi Republic is taking legal action against this Federal Government Order and the Duma is in the process of considering a law, despite objections from the State Committee on Ecology, which would allow mining in Russia's national parks.

The Russian State Committee for the Environment informed the Centre on 17 November 1998 that the site is under regular inspections from the State Committee and that the last inspection was carried out in June/July 1998. It revealed violations of the national legislation by enterprises specialised in gold mining on the site. All companies were given orders to suspend their illegal activities. The administration of the Yugyd Va National Park was obliged to register all affected lands and to prepare a land re-cultivation programme. IUCN informed the Bureau that the WWF Biodiversity Programme is carrying out a five Million Swiss Franc project on boreal forest conservation in the Komi Republic with SF 400,000 earmarked for the Pechora Ilytch Zapovednik portion of the site.

The Bureau commended the Russian authorities on the actions taken to halt the mining activities at Virgin Komi Forests, and WWF for initiating a conservation project. The Bureau invited the State Party to provide a report on the rehabilitation of impacted areas. Furthermore, the Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to contact the authorities in the Komi Republic to discuss any boundary issues relevant to the Virgin Komi Forests.

#### **Skocjan Caves (Slovenia)**

IUCN has informed the Centre that the Regional Vice-Chair of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

attended a meeting in May 1998 for the preparation of a management plan for this site. The Regional Office of the Park, established in 1997, has completed the first phase of the management plan; however, the May 1998 meeting identified several problems, including the need to improve visitor facilities and training new rangers. WCPA and EUROPARC Federation offered to provide expert advice on park facilities and proposed to organize workshops in the Regional Park for training personnel on cave and karst protection. The Park has also invited IUCN to provide advice on the preparation of the management plan.

The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a request for organizing an *in-situ* training activity focusing on the conservation of European World Heritage sites with cave and karst features for possible financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to co-operate with the State Party to provide any assistance needed in the preparation and finalisation of a management plan for the site.

#### **Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries (Thailand)**

The Bureau was informed that this site has been severely damaged by fires that had affected Thailand and other countries in the region. Forest fire prevention was identified to be the major management issue in this site by IUCN, Centre and other experts and managers who visited the site as part of a World Heritage workshop hosted by Thailand during 19-23 January 1998. Most participants to the workshop identified the need for greater involvement of local people in the management of the site, including the prevention of forest fires. Following that workshop, the Chairperson has approved a sum of US\$ 20,000 for a project, designed and submitted by the National Committee for the Protection of the World Heritage of Thailand, for research, training and raising awareness of local people on forest fire prevention and control. The results of the project will be used to review and revise the fire management policy of the site. The project foresees the implementation of joint activities by site staff and representatives of local communities in forest fire prevention and control during the next dry season that will begin after November 1998.

The Observer of Thailand informed the Bureau that he would make a statement on this property at the time of the twenty-second session of the Committee. A representative of IUCN pointed out that IUCN's Forestry Programme was developing an initiative focusing on forest fires in Asia and that IUCN will explore possibilities to launch actions that could assist forest fire prevention and control in this site.

The Bureau requested the Centre, IUCN and the State Party to co-operate to ensure timely implementation of the project to review and revise the forest fire management policy in this site and to elaborate a forest fire management policy that solicits the co-operation of local people. The Bureau invited the State Party to submit a report on the outcome of fire management practices that may be tested out during the forthcoming dry season for the consideration of the twenty-third session of the Bureau.

#### **St. Kilda (United Kingdom)**

The Centre transmitted the report entitled "Threats to St. Kilda World Heritage Site from Proposed Oil Exploration and Production in the Atlantic Frontier", prepared by Greenpeace International, to IUCN for review. This report has raised serious

concerns on potential impacts to this site, particularly in the event of a possible oil spill that may result from the use of the Floating Production, Storage and Offloading Facilities (FPSOs). There are important threats associated with pollution derived from by-products of oil exploration and drilling activities. IUCN has informed the Centre that the State Party is currently considering the establishment of a special Area of Conservation for the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago under the European Union's Habitats and Species Directive. IUCN has welcomed this initiative and expressed the hope that it would lead to the eventual extension of the World Heritage site to include the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago.

The Observer of the United Kingdom informed the Bureau that his Government is in the process of preparing a detailed response on the issues raised. Any licence is subject to a thorough review, which is co-ordinated by Scottish Heritage.

The Bureau invited the State Party to take all possible measures to protect St. Kilda from potential adverse impacts of oil exploration and production in the Atlantic frontier and to consult with all interested parties before proceeding with such activities. The Bureau welcomed the State Party's initiative to extend the boundaries of the site to include the seas of the St. Kilda archipelago.

#### **Ha Long Bay (Vietnam)**

At its twenty-second ordinary session (June 1998), the Bureau noted that the study on environmental management for Ha Long Bay designed and implemented by Vietnam and JICA, commenced in February 1998 and is expected to proceed until October 1999. This study will run parallel to the Environmental Impact Assessment of the Cailan Port construction project. The Bureau was also informed of negotiations between Vietnam and Japan for the construction of the Bai Chay Bridge, expected to link Bai Chay Beach to Ha Long City across the Bai Chay Bay. A loan agreement for providing engineering services for the construction of this bridge was signed, in March 1998, by OECF, Japan, and the Government of Vietnam and includes a feasibility study as well as an environmental impact assessment of the bridge construction project.

The Vietnam authorities have provided an "explanation report" of the Bai Chay Bridge construction project, a detailed technical study outline report on the environmental management for Ha Long Bay, a report on Engineering Services and EIA for the Bai Chay Bay Bridge construction project; and a report on the feasibility study on the Bai Chay Bridge construction project. Furthermore, a report of a project, jointly implemented by the UNESCO National Commission and IUCN Vietnam on a study of the geomorphology of Ha Long Bay, focusing in particular on karst features, has also been received. The Bureau furthermore noted that an East Asia meeting on impacts of limestone quarrying on biodiversity and cultural heritage (23-29 January), and a national conference on the development of the Quang Ninh – Hai Phong Region (April) are planned for 1999. They are expected to generate new information relevant to the conservation of Ha Long Bay. In addition, preliminary results of the JICA/Vietnam Environmental Study on Ha Long Bay are also expected to be released before the end of 1998.

The Bureau urged the Centre and IUCN to liaise with donors and international agencies in order to obtain all information resulting from on-going studies and proposed conferences and meetings scheduled for 1999 and undertake a thorough review of the large volume of data contained in the reports submitted by

the Government of Vietnam. The Bureau requests the Centre and IUCN to provide a state of conservation report on Ha Long Bay to the twenty-third session of the Committee in 1999.

#### **Durmitor National Park (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia)**

At its twenty-second session, the Bureau was informed that a map showing the 40 ha area to be excised from the Park is under preparation. The Park authorities have transmitted other information requested by the Bureau in November 1997 to the Federal Ministry for the Protection of the Environment (FMPE). The Bureau noted that there is a global protection regime for the Tara River and its Canyon. The Centre has requested the Permanent Delegation of the State Party to UNESCO to obtain the documentation sent by the Park authorities from the FMPE. No information was received from the State Party.

The Bureau recommended that the State Party submit to the Centre, before 15 April 1999, the map showing the 40 ha area to be excised from the Park to enable the Bureau to review the map at its twenty-third session. The Bureau requested the Centre to continue its efforts to obtain the information transmitted by the Park authorities to the FMPE.

The Bureau furthermore decided to adopt the UN official name for the State Party as follows: **Federal Republic of Yugoslavia**.

#### **Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe)**

The Bureau was informed that IUCN had reviewed the "Scoping Report: Potential impacts associated with the proposed development of the Mosi-Oa-Tunya Hotel Complex", prepared by the Division of Water, Environment and Forestry Technology, CSIR, South Africa. This report was commissioned by Sun International, the company that would like to develop this hotel complex on the Zambian side of this trans-border World Heritage site. From IUCN's point of view, the key issues of concern are that: (a) the location of the proposed development is within the boundaries of the site and particularly close to the banks of the rivers; (b) institutional support that should be provided by the Zambian Government to address environmental problems is not defined; (c) given that the site belongs to two States Parties, the Government of Zambia needs to discuss the project with the Government of Zimbabwe, to seek the latter's agreement on implementation policies, procedures and schedules.

The response of the Zimbabwean Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (ZDNPWLM) to the hotel development proposal of Sun International has been transmitted to the Centre, on 25 September 1998, by the Zimbabwe National Commission for UNESCO. ZDNPWLM has emphasised the need to preserve the World Heritage site as a global asset and stressed that any development proposal should be subject to EIA procedures that invite full public involvement. ZDNPWLM has pointed out that it lacks details and information on the hotel development proposal. Hence, ZDNPWLM is unable to make specific and constructive comments or endorse the development proposal.

The Bureau requested the Centre to co-operate with the IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa to organize a bi-national meeting to bring representatives from the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe together. The meeting should be designed and organized in a manner so as to clarify issues concerning this development project in accordance with the joint

responsibility of the two States Parties to conserve and properly manage this trans-border World Heritage property. The Bureau also supported the ZDNPWLM's position to emphasise the need to preserve the World Heritage site as a global asset and that any development proposal should be subject to EIA procedures with full public involvement.

### **MIXED (CULTURAL AND NATURAL) HERITAGE**

#### **Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)**

At its twenty-first session, the Bureau had requested the State Party to provide a timetable for the implementation of the Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA), including possible boundary extensions to the World Heritage site. The Australian authorities have informed the Centre that negotiations between the Tasmanian and the Commonwealth Governments for setting a timetable, potentially involving the extension of the boundaries of the World Heritage site, are underway. They have undertaken to provide the timetable when the two Governments reach an agreement.

The Bureau requested the Centre to transmit the report from the Australian NGO's to the State Party for review. The Bureau recommended that the Centre and IUCN maintain contacts with the Australian authorities to obtain information on the timetable for the implementation of the RFA once an agreement between the Tasmanian and Commonwealth Governments is reached.

#### **Mount Taishan (China)**

The Bureau was informed that a Centre-IUCN mission which visited the site in September 1998 was concerned by the management's stated desire to open up three new scenic spots in Heavenly Candle, Rear Rock Basin and Jade Spring scenic spots. The number of vendor stalls along the walking route may also have to be considerably reduced. Furthermore, the management needs to place an emphasis on learning more about the natural heritage values of the area and on educating visitors on the cultural and natural values of the area of World Heritage significance.

The Bureau invites the State Party to take steps to determine the tourism carrying capacity of the World Heritage site and on the basis of that determination elaborate a visitor management and a tourism development plan for the site. Furthermore, the Bureau urged the management of the site to place more emphasis on learning more about the natural heritage values of the area and on educating visitors on the cultural and natural values of the area of World Heritage significance. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities, and for review by ICOMOS.

#### **Mount Huangshan (China)**

The IUCN-Centre site mission in September 1998 found Mt. Huangshan's management of visitors and tourism development to be exemplary. However, the mission team urged the management to consider implementing a "one-way" walking route for visitors moving across and around peaks in order to further minimize congestion. Even if site management proceeds with its plan to develop a long distance path to the Nine Dragon Peaks to alleviate pressure on the more popular scenic spots, it should not permit the development of any new hotels in the vicinity of those Peaks. The natural heritage values of this site are receiving increasing attention and the team welcomed the



management's interest to promote research on biodiversity of the area and to communicate the findings to visitors. The State Party needs to be encouraged to support the management's concern to combat the pine-wilt disease that appears to be infesting the legendary Huangshan pines.

The Bureau commended the State Party for its effective management of visitor and tourism development in the site and invites all concerned authorities of the State Party to: (a) establish a "one-way" walking route for visitors moving across and around peaks; (b) not permit the development of new hotels in the vicinity of popular scenic spots, including the Nine Dragon Peaks; (c) promote research on biodiversity of the site and communicate the findings to the visitors and (d) take all necessary measures to combat the pine-wilt disease infesting the legendary Huangshan pines. The Bureau recommended that the report of the IUCN/Centre mission to China be transmitted to the relevant Chinese authorities, and for review by ICOMOS.

#### **Ohrid Region with its Cultural and Historical Aspect and its Natural Environment (Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of)**

A joint UNESCO-ICOMOS-IUCN monitoring mission was carried out in September 1998 for the first time since the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in 1979.

The mission report draws particular attention to the fact that at the time of inscription of this mixed property on the List, the well preserved old towns of Ohrid and Struga were set in an almost untouched natural environment on the shores of the Lake Ohrid. As to cultural heritage, only specifically listed monuments are inscribed on the World Heritage List. These monuments are very well preserved. The natural heritage includes part of the Lake which is territory of the country (and excludes the part on the territory of Albania) and part of the Galicia National Park. Now, the enormous increase in constructions and settlement activities has seriously altered the original balance in the region: for example, the town of Struga has incorporated ten new sub-communities.

The mission observed that the authorities undertake great efforts for the preservation of the natural and cultural heritage of the site. However, economic and demographic developments pose threats to the values of the site that can only be addressed through an integrated approach and protective measures that link the cultural and the natural heritage preservation.

The mission report includes a set of recommendations calling for a special legal framework for the World Heritage site (integrating culture and nature), the strengthening of the management, the preparation of Spatial Plan for the area and the towns, and the extension of the site to include the whole of the Galicia National Park.

The Bureau took note of the report of the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to the mixed World Heritage site of Ohrid Region with its Cultural and Historical Aspect and its Natural Environment (Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of). It commended the Government of the country for the efforts taken for the preservation of the monuments and environment in Ohrid. It recommended the Government to consider the recommendations of the mission carefully, particularly with regard to integrated planning and legal protection of the natural and cultural heritage. It also requested the authorities to review the definition of the cultural heritage, to define and propose revised boundaries, if appropriate, and to establish adequate

buffer zones. It requested the Government to provide a response to the report by 15 April 1999, for consideration by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

#### **Cliff of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) (Mali)**

A cultural heritage inventory programme, financed by UNESCO's World Heritage Fund in 1995-96, was the starting point of an important work of identification, diagnostic and ad hoc interventions that the Cultural Mission and other partners (Konstanz University and Mali research architects) carry out to improve the conservation of this heritage, which is both cultural and natural.

The Cultural Mission, with funding from the State of Mali, carries out in a continuous manner an awareness campaign throughout the 289 villages of the site, concerning the protection and the enhancement of the heritage elements. The «cities and historical sites» comprising the project «Urban Development and Decentralization» (UNDP), Land of the Dogons, are: the creation of a Documentation Centre on the Dogon Culture at Bandiagara, the rehabilitation of the Songo encampment and the management of the trails in the Sangha region.

The Bureau congratulated the Mali authorities for the efforts undertaken to preserve this site inscribed on the World Heritage List. It invited the Mali authorities, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the «Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention» to: (i) co-ordinate international assistance, and (ii) inform the World Heritage Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intentions to undertake or to authorize, in an area protected by the Convention, major restoration works. The Bureau also encouraged the authorities to implement awareness building activities among the population.

#### **Tongariro National Park (New Zealand)**

The New Zealand authorities in their letter of 11 September 1998, have pointed out that an eruption of the Mt. Ruapehu in 1953 caused one of the country's major civilian disasters and that there is an inevitability of a lahar from the crater following the present eruption. The Minister for Conservation has called for a comprehensive environmental and cultural assessment identifying the risks and assessing impacts of options for their mitigation. The New Zealand authorities consider the following three as the most practical options at present:

- (a) installing an alarm and warning system;
- (b) building structures off the mountain to contain the lahar expected when the ash-dam fails; and
- (c) bulldozing a trench through the ash-dam itself, although the sub-option of hand digging a shallow trench has not yet been entirely dismissed.

The Park management is in regular consultation with the Ngati Rangi and the Ngati Tuwharetoa Tribes to exchange information and views and it appears very clear that they do not like the idea of engineering works at the Crater Lake. Ngati Rangi consider that the excavation at the crater "challenges the indigenous integrity and strength of the cultural World Heritage status" of the Park. However, both Tribes understand the risks to public safety and infrastructure (e.g. bridges and roads) and the Paramount Chief of Ngati Tuwharetoa intends to convene a consultation group to work through the issues with Park management. When the draft report on the environmental and cultural assessment is ready to be released, both Tribes will be

consulted. The Department of Conservation is committed to a consultation process that will support an exemplary code of ethical conduct and field conservation practice that emphasise social responsibility and cultural sensitivity. The Director of the Centre, who attended the World Heritage celebrations in Tongariro National Park during the weekend of 21-22 November 1998 confirmed this extremely sensitive approach taken by the management in searching for solutions to this issue.

The Bureau commended the New Zealand authorities for the ethically and culturally sensitive manner in which they are addressing this issue. The Bureau requested the Centre and IUCN to submit a status update on the management of the ash build up at the Crater Lake outlet on Mt. Ruapehu to its twenty-third session in 1999.

## **CULTURAL HERITAGE**

### **Rapa Nui National Park (Chile)**

Early 1998, the Secretariat received information about the possible construction of a new harbour within the World Heritage site, the extraction of stone and problems in the management of the Park. In response, the Chilean authorities informed that the harbour project was indeed considered some years ago but that this project at present was not being pursued; and that the extraction of stone is strictly controlled by the Council of National Monuments in accordance with what is foreseen in the Management Programme for the Natural Heritage and the Master Plan for the Rapa Nui National Park. A close collaboration has been established between the Council for National Monuments and the National Forestry Agency (CONAF) and consultations with the local authorities are taking place. No new authorisations have been given for archaeological excavations, awaiting a specific ordinance for excavations and research.

As to the management of the Park, the authorities informed that a Management Plan for the Rapa Nui National Park was adopted in February 1998, copy of which was made available to the Secretariat and ICOMOS.

A comprehensive programme for the preservation of Rapa Nui has been prepared by the National Conservation Centre, the University of Chile and the National Forestry Agency (CONAF) and submitted for consideration under the Japanese Funds-in-Trust. The programme would include items such as: the preservation of stone, cultural anthropology, the environment and equipment.

The Bureau thanked the Chilean authorities for the information provided on the management of the Park and the adoption of the management plan. It requested the Chilean authorities to keep the Committee informed of future planning, infrastructural works and excavations that might be planned for the Park.

### **The Mountain Resort and its Outlying Temples in Chengde (China)**

The Bureau, at its twentieth extraordinary session in 1996, recommended that the Chinese authorities adopt a development plan for the town of Chengde in line with World Heritage conservation needs. The Chinese authorities reported to the Secretariat, in a state of conservation report on this property submitted in July 1998, that the city planning department has included World Heritage protection in the historic city's urban development plan.

According to this report, conservation work has continued since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1994. A 10-year Renovation Plan of the site was prepared by national experts and approved by the Bureau of Cultural Relics of Chengde City in 1995. An "Overall Management Plan for Chengde City" was adopted by Hebei Provincial Government in 1995. Afforestation measures have been taken for the gardens and the surroundings of the site, with vegetation coverage currently exceeding 90%.

Training and education activities carried out by the site administration have enabled the training of more than 3,500 persons. Promotion "week" and "month" were organized by the City Government to increase the understanding and application of the Law on the Protection of Cultural Relics. Chengde Research Institute of Cultural Properties was established in 1995. Over 30 on-site staff have been trained at other institutes or universities. With assistance from the World Heritage Fund, a Training Course for Site Managers of Cultural World Heritage Properties in China was organized in September 1997 by the State Bureau of Cultural Relics. In addition, the Mayor of Chengde participated in the International Conference for Mayors of Historic Cities in China and the European Union in April 1998 (Suzhou) organized by the World Heritage Centre and exchanged experiences with counterparts from China and the EU.

Security conditions at the site museum have improved, thanks to the technical and equipment support made available from the World Heritage Fund. The security staff has increased from 200 to 300 persons since 1995. 3.4 million RMB *Yuan* (US\$411,600) was invested in the restoration project of Xu Mi Fu Shou Temple and the conservation of artifacts in the site museums.

The management of the site has been strengthened with the Vice-Mayor of Chengde City assuming the responsible supervision of all administration work. A decision was taken to further intensify the protection of the site by the City government so as to strengthen the implementation of the Management Plan.

The Bureau was informed by the World Heritage Centre of reports received concerning increasing urban and tourism development pressures negatively affecting the historical setting within the buffer zone of this site.

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities and commended the local authorities for their efforts in enhancing the management of the site. The Bureau, however, expressed concern over the rapidly increasing urban pressure within the buffer zone and encouraged the relevant authorities to take appropriate measures to integrate tourism development and urban heritage conservation issues in the Management Plan of the site.

### **The Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)**

In approving the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List at its eighteenth session in 1994, the Committee recommended the Chinese authorities to extend the boundary to include Jokhang Temple and the surrounding historic quarters. This point was discussed at the twentieth extraordinary session of the Bureau and the Delegate of China informed the Bureau that the Chinese authorities were in favour of this extension as recommended by the Committee. A report was submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the State Bureau of Cultural Relics of

China in July 1998, which indicated that the Government of the Tibetan Autonomous Region would be formally requesting the inclusion of Jokhang Temple within this site, and that the responsible Chinese authorities would proceed accordingly. On 18 August 1998, the World Heritage Centre requested the Director-General of the State Bureau of Cultural Relics of China to provide further information on the progress of the extension before 1 October 1998. No written report was however been received by the Secretariat.

To protect the setting of the site, modern residences and shops around the square in front of the Palace, which were not in harmony with the historical monuments, were removed by the local authority. The use of traditional building material and methods in the restoration work is being promoted so as to preserve the original architectural features of the site. Publications concerning the architectural styles, paintings, sculptures and the contents of all the cultural properties of the Potala Palace were issued by the local authorities to raise awareness amongst the general public.

The Bureau was informed that the World Heritage Centre has received numerous reports on the demolition of historic buildings and new construction activities in the Barkhor historic area which encircles the Jokhang Temple in the religiously symbolic urban form of the “mandala”.

The Bureau took note of the efforts made by the responsible Chinese authorities to prepare the extension of the Potala Palace World Heritage site to include the Jokhang Temple. The Bureau also noted the efforts being made by the local authorities in safeguarding the essential historical setting of this site. It requested the State Party for additional information concerning Barkhor historic area which is also part of the extension area recommended by the Committee at the time of the inscription of this site.

#### **Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu (China)**

According to a state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities in July 1998, efforts have been made to conserve the authenticity of the site. To improve the setting of the site, the Divine Road connecting the monumental sites was restored by using traditional building material and the protection of ancient trees was strengthened. A computerized management system has been put into place to monitor all the cultural properties, ancient trees and the ancient monuments within the site. Lighting facilities in the ancient buildings were replaced and electricity wiring was placed underground. Safety and fire prevention measures have also been strengthened.

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities and encouraged the responsible authorities to undertake further actions to enhance the management of the site, especially taking into consideration development issues such as land-use, sustainable tourism, and vegetation management.

#### **Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China)**

According to a state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities in July 1998, a commission of experts for the preservation of this site was established by the local authorities. Subsequently, legal measures which strengthen the protection of Wudang Mountains have been put into effect. The

transfer of the local residents inhabiting the ancient buildings to areas outside the site has been undertaken. Restoration work has been carried out to repair the Purple Cloud Hall and a number of ancient buildings. An Administration Bureau was established to enhance the management and preservation of the site. Increased financial resources have been made available towards the preservation of the ancient building complex. A “Master Plan for the Development of Wudang Mountains” has also been formulated. The local authorities have included the protection, presentation and restoration of cultural properties as one of the top priorities within their programme for social development.

The Bureau took note of the state of conservation report submitted by the Chinese authorities and of the efforts made by the local authorities to implement adequate management measures to protect this site. The Bureau requested the national and local authorities to incorporate sustainable tourism development strategies within the site management plan to ensure that the integrity of the site’s cultural and historical setting is protected.

#### **City of Quito (Ecuador)**

The UNESCO Representative in Quito, informed the Secretariat on 7 October 1998 that the Volcano Pichincha, in the vicinity of the western part of the City of Quito, had become active after three hundred years. An eruption (most probably stones and acid ashes) could seriously imperil the lives of the inhabitants of villages and the City of Quito and could affect its historic centre and its monuments. The National Geophysical Institute has established a scientific committee with experts from the United States of America to monitor the situation. The Mayor of Quito, who has been assigned by the Government with the responsibility for the crisis management, has approached UNESCO for immediate support for:

- preventive measures at the historic monuments of Quito ;
- expert advice on planning and management of this type of crisis in urban areas.

At the time of preparation of this document, the Secretariat is in contact with the national authorities, the UNESCO Office in Quito and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee about the appropriate response to this situation.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the Secretariat and requested the State Party to keep the Secretariat informed on the situation.

#### **Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt)**

In 1995, a mission from the World Heritage Centre visited Egypt to prevent the construction, within the boundaries of the protected zone, of a portion of the Greater Cairo “Ring-Road”. A joint declaration was then issued and the project cancelled. A proposal for the diversion of the Ring Road was then suggested. On 6 September 1998, the Secretariat received a letter from the President of the Supreme Council of Antiquities requesting UNESCO to send a mission of specialists to study details of the diversion plan and provide them with technical advice.

On 3 October, a mission from UNESCO proceeded to Cairo and worked on this issue with the Supreme Council of Antiquities and the concerned ministries. A joint communiqué, signed by the Supreme Council of Antiquities, the Ministry of Housing and Reconstruction and UNESCO urged for a full

implementation of the Convention and reconfirmed the alternative route selected during the previous UNESCO mission in 1995 (diversion through the Maryoutiyah and Mansouriyah canals). At the request of the authorities, the Centre will start co-operation for the improvement of the management of the site.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to continue co-operating with the Egyptian authorities on this issue as well as on the overall management of the site and to report on the progress of the work to the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

#### **Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt)**

The Secretariat has received from various sources, mainly scholars involved in research work, detailed information about renewed plans by the authorities to transfer the inhabitants of the old village of Gurnah to a new location, outside the boundaries of the site. This plan of relocating Gurnah has been considered for decades, the first attempt having seen the involvement of the reputed Egyptian architect, Hassan Fathi in the conception of the new village of "Gurna El-Gadidah". The inhabitants of Gurnah, who have always been involved in the archaeological excavations as workers or specialized manpower have opposed their displacement to a new village. The reasons for the decision of the authorities are that the village is built on an archaeological land, that the inhabitants are looting the sites surrounding them and that the waste water created by the village is destroying some archaeological sites.

The Secretariat is of the opinion that this issue be taken in a broader manner and that a full-fledged study of the situation in the site be undertaken (encompassing geological, archaeological and geographical surveys and mapping, anthropological studies, assessment of the historical and cultural landscape qualities of the foothills and of the presence of Gurnah in the site). A comprehensive management plan could then be prepared to include the concept of a separate cultural landscape nomination for the villages of Gurnah and their environment.

After having taken note of the information provided, the Bureau requested the Secretariat to study with the Egyptian authorities the possibility of launching a co-operation programme encompassing geological, archaeological and geographical surveys and mapping, anthropological studies, assessment of the historical and cultural landscape qualities of the foothills and of the presence of Gurnah in the site. The Bureau also recommended to the Egyptian authorities the postponement of any further transfer of the population of Gurnah until these investigations have taken place, and urged the authorities to establish an awareness campaign among the local community.

#### **Islamic Cairo (Arab Republic of Egypt)**

Based on the recommendation of the Bureau at its twenty-second session and on a request of the Minister of Culture addressed to the Director-General of UNESCO endorsing the results of the brain-storming session of June 1998, the Centre has sent from 3 to 11 October a mission of specialists to Cairo to prepare a three-year strategy and conservation programme for Islamic Cairo. This co-operation programme is submitted for consideration to the World Heritage Committee under requests for international assistance.

Regarding the issue of Al Azhar Mosque, the Centre received a technical report containing the architectural standards applied for the work on the monument from the Supreme Council of

Antiquities in Egypt. The Centre transmitted the report to ICOMOS and ICCROM on 23 November 1998.

Regarding awareness creation among concerned parties in the Arab Region in favour of the built religious heritage, as suggested by members of the Bureau, the Centre is proposing to organize in 1999 a meeting on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and architectural standards in religious sites and monuments. During the twenty-second extraordinary session of the Bureau, the representative of Lebanon suggested that the meeting cover different types of monuments and not only religious ones, considering the diversity of the monuments in the Arab Region. He also offered to host the meeting in Lebanon.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau thanked the Egyptian authorities for their co-operation with the Centre and requested the Secretariat to do its utmost in the implementation of the co-operation programme in favour of Islamic Cairo.

The Bureau took also note of the report submitted by the authorities on the works at the Al-Azhar Mosque. It requested ICOMOS to undertake an in-depth evaluation of the report for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

The Bureau also requested the Secretariat to organize as soon as possible the seminar on monuments and properties in the Arab Region.

#### **Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia)**

On 13 October 1998, the Secretariat received an urgent request from the UNESCO National Commission of Estonia for advice on a project for a new theatre in medieval buildings within the World Heritage site of the Historic Centre of Tallinn. ICOMOS was able to respond immediately by sending an expert to Tallinn.

Having listened to the report by ICOMOS, the Bureau expressed its concern about the adverse impact of the proposed theatre project on the medieval centre of Tallinn. It requested the State Party to give urgent consideration to the selection of an alternative location for this important cultural project and alternative uses for the medieval buildings concerned.

#### **Collegiate Church, Castle and Old Town in Quedlinburg (Germany)**

A comprehensive state of conservation report has been submitted by the German Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt which focuses on the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee in Naples 1997. In order to guide and assist with conservation, preservation and development of Quedlinburg a number of activities have been carried out. These refer to measures taken to strengthen and improve planning, legal protection and control mechanisms.

ICOMOS advised the Secretariat that this report is very encouraging. The City authorities have taken energetic and positive steps to take account of the points made by the recent expert mission.

The Bureau commended the German authorities on this extensive and very encouraging report and requested the State Party to submit a progress report by 15 September 1999 for

examination by the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau.

### **Historic Centre of Florence (Italy)**

The Secretariat and the Chairperson informed the Bureau that they had received a number of letters of concern about the possible impact of the construction of a high tension power line through the landscape surrounding the city of Florence. The Delegate of Italy confirmed that such a project exists and that, although outside of the World Heritage site, it could be visible from some location in the city. He informed that a review was being undertaken to identify measures to minimise the impact of the project on the city and the landscape.

The Bureau requested the Italian authorities to consider this matter and to submit a report on it by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

### **Quseir Amra (Jordan)**

In August 1998, the Centre received a letter from the Director-General of the Antiquities in Jordan stating that the Jordanian authorities in co-operation with IFAPO had already completed the alternative plan of the Visitors' Centre at Quseir Amra. The proposed location is East of the ancient Roman bath within the fenced area and at a good distance from the monument. The Director-General of the Antiquities also stated in his letter that the idea to divert the Visitors' Centre to the other side of the highway would be unrealistic and would threaten the safety of the visitors in crossing the highway.

The Centre requested the authority to send a detailed plan to be forwarded to ICOMOS for evaluation.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and the evaluation of ICOMOS, the Bureau endorsed the views of the Jordanian authorities concerning the location of the Visitors' Centre. However, it requested the authorities to do their utmost to minimize the impact of the Visitors' Centre on the landscape and to provide the Secretariat with a proposal in this respect. Moreover, the Bureau requested the Jordanian authorities to continue preserving works of the mural paintings of the Roman bath.

### **Luang Prabang (Laos)**

The Heritage House (*Maison du patrimoine*), a conservation and development advisory service for inhabitants which is a service of the Provincial Authorities of Luang Prabang that reports to the Local Provincial Committee for the Protection and Development of Cultural and Natural Heritage, initiated the second phase of the Safeguarding and Development Plan of Luang Prabang. Architectural surveys of 1000 buildings owned by private individuals or religious groups located within the centre of the World Heritage site were completed and surveys of all Government-owned buildings and public space are currently being undertaken. The elaboration of this Plan and other related activities, such as the restoration of the traditional timber buildings and colonial buildings through on-site training activities are being carried out within the framework of the Luang Prabang-Chinon (France) decentralized co-operation agreement signed in August 1997 under the aegis of UNESCO. Following the study tour to France by the Governor of Luang Prabang in September 1997, the four Lao architects of the Heritage House visited France in July 1998, both financed by the French Foreign Ministry.

Following the Luang Prabang-Chinon-UNESCO technical meeting held in April 1998, the Governor of Luang Prabang was presented with a list of buildings recommended for protection. Upon approval by the Governor of the list of all scheduled buildings, it will be submitted to the national authorities for official legal protection.

In addition to the daily work of advising on building permits and field inspection of on-going construction works, the Heritage House with support from the town of Chinon and UNESCO, developed two major project proposals. One on the protection of the urban humid zone prepared by the Institute of Aquatic and Fluvial Research of Chinon (IMACOF/Tours University), under funding from the World Heritage Fund and Chinon, was co-funded by the European Commission for ECU 350,000 (US\$ 380,000). The second, aimed to strengthen local capacity in urban management and to conduct a number of demonstrative rehabilitations of public space, has been funded by the French Agency for Development, for the sum of FF 10 million (US\$ 1.95 million) over a 3-year period. Co-operation with Region Centre (France) has continued with the confirmation of their second earmarked contribution to the World Heritage Fund for the sum of FF 300,000 within the total amount of FF 1 million pledged in the Agreement with UNESCO in 1997 for the rehabilitation of the former French customs building being converted for re-use as the Luang Prabang Site Information Centre. Close collaboration has been established between the Heritage House and the project team executing the Asian Development Bank project on road and riverbank upgrading, and with the German development aid agency, KfW, implementing the drainage and sewage improvement project. Both these being important infrastructural projects that would greatly benefit the inhabitants, but could have a negative impact on the cultural heritage of the town if carried out without adequate care and sensitivity to the fragile patrimonial value of the site.

The 1998 World Heritage grant of US\$ 25000 has enabled the preparation of pedagogical tools to inform the local population of the Safeguarding and Development Plan and its implications to the inhabitants, which include a video film, panel exhibition and information leaflets. A community-based meeting foreseen under this WHF project is scheduled to commence in January 1999 upon the completion of the educational tools.

The draft law on Protection of National Cultural and Natural Heritage which was prepared in 1996 with legal assistance from UNESCO and the French Government, was issued as a Decree of the Council of Ministers in May 1997 but has not yet been officially enacted as law by the National Assembly.

The Bureau commended the efforts of the Luang Prabang Provincial authorities, particularly the Heritage House as well as the national authorities in the substantive and rapid progress made in strengthening the legal and administrative framework to protect and conserve this site. The Bureau, also commended the Heritage House-Chinon-UNESCO project team for having successfully mobilized close to US\$ 4.5 million from bilateral and multilateral donor sources in less than three years by using financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund in a catalytic manner to generate other co-operation projects. The Bureau however, recommended the national and local authorities of the State Party to remain vigilant in co-ordinating the numerous aid and investment projects, particularly those of the Asian Development Bank and German KfW to ensure that these infrastructural development projects are carried out without

undermining the World Heritage value of the site. The Bureau requested the State Party to make all efforts for the enactment of the national law on cultural and natural heritage protection by the National Assembly which is presently a decree, and to approve an official list of protected buildings and to forward a copy of these to UNESCO.

#### **Baalbek (Lebanon)**

Expressions of concern have been received by the Secretariat about extensive rehabilitation works being undertaken by the Lebanese Department of Antiquities contrary to established procedures. After the twenty-second session of the Bureau, the Centre received letters from the Lebanese authorities explaining the waterproofing works of the "crypto-portico", which was to be used as an exhibition area for the celebration of the centenary of the German excavations in Baalbek (November 1998). The German Archaeological Institute has confirmed to the Secretariat that the waterproofing works were technically sound and reversible.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat and the clarification stated by the Lebanese authorities, the Bureau thanked the authorities for the information received. It also thanked the German Archaeological Institute for its assistance in this matter, and congratulated the Lebanese authorities for the protective actions taken for the site by expropriating plots in front of the main entrance. Finally, the Bureau reminded the Lebanese authorities of the necessity to prepare a long awaited management plan for the site.

#### **Tyre (Lebanon)**

In September 1998, the Minister of Public Works of Lebanon was invited to a meeting with the Secretariat and with the President of the International Association for the Safeguarding of Tyre. At this meeting, which was also attended by a UNESCO consultant working on the Master Plan of Tyre, the Minister presented the work undertaken and planned by his Ministry and requested UNESCO to provide assistance to secure the proper integration of archaeology in the Master Plan and in his Ministry's works. The Division of Cultural Heritage of UNESCO, in charge of the international campaign launched in March 1998, had already started this technical support by sending an expert in urban planning in July 1998, whose report has now been transmitted to the Lebanese authorities.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau welcomed the request of the Ministry of Public Works to be advised by UNESCO and recommended that the co-operation between the Lebanese authorities and UNESCO in preparing the Master Plan of Tyre be reinforced. The Bureau also requested :

- that the safeguarding of the archaeological and historical areas of Tyre be considered by the Lebanese authorities as a top priority in the preparation of this Master Plan
- and that any infrastructural work within the site be suspended until the adoption of this Master Plan.

#### **Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania)**

The Bureau recalled that considerable assistance had been provided since 1995 for the revitalisation of Vilnius Old Town, not only from the World Heritage Fund, but also from others such as the Canadian Urban Institute, Edinburgh, the Nordic World Heritage Office, ICCROM, UNDP etc. With this assistance, meetings and a donors' conference were organised,

training and expert advice has been provided as well as consultant services.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau that a major achievement had been obtained by the creation of the Old Town Revitalisation Agency (OTRA), a joint agency between the Ministry for Culture and the Municipality of Vilnius. An Old Town Revitalisation Fund would be established shortly. Both OTRA and the Fund will concentrate on the development of specific projects and programmes. To this effect, a technical assistance programme will be drafted by UNESCO and UNDP.

A request for international assistance for US\$ 20,000 was received for consideration by the Chairperson, to support this programme.

The Bureau took note with satisfaction of the considerable progress made in setting up the institutional framework for the revitalisation of the Vilnius Historic Centre. The Bureau commended in particular the Government of Lithuania and the Municipality of Vilnius on the creation of the Old Town Revitalisation Agency (OTRA). It encouraged the authorities to continue its efforts to develop and implement policies, programmes and projects for the revitalisation of the city.

#### **Old Towns of Djenné (Mali)**

In close co-operation with the village populations adjacent to the archaeological sites, and the administrative offices, the Cultural Mission of Djenné has carried out, since 1994, information, awareness-building and education activities with the local population, stressing the imperative need to preserve and promote cultural heritage.

Following an inventory of the conservation of the monuments of the Town of Djenné, the Cultural Mission had undertaken the restoration of some monuments, and, thanks to support from participants of the international youth workshop, held in December 1996, the inner walls of Konofia were restored.

Co-operation between Mali and The Netherlands resulted in a project comprising the restoration of 168 dwellings in the old quarter, which began in October 1996. This project, for a duration of six years, has the following essential objectives:

- safeguard of cultural heritage
- strengthen cultural identity through the promotion of the significance of earth architecture
- ensure training in the field of the restoration of historical monuments, whilst respecting the local construction techniques,
- contribute towards the economic development of the populations.

At the request of the Minister for Culture, a project entitled « Reappropriation and improvement of the urban area of Djenné » with the objective of an integrated and concerted development of cultural tourism, will permit the implementation of harmonized action. This would concern the improvement of solid and liquid waste management and their co-ordination with other conservation projects carried out through co-operation between the Cultural Mission of Djenné and The Netherlands. The project, which is decentralized to Dakar, will be financed up to 100 million CFA, in the framework of a shared phase with local populations. The project is part of the network of activities implemented by the « Human Habitat » Unit of the Social Sciences Sector of UNESCO.

In the framework of the Third Urban Project, the execution of a global plan for the conservation of the old Town of Djenné is foreseen. This plan will comprise activities to improve sanitation, the construction of the Museum, and the construction of green areas, all of which will contribute towards the development of sustainable tourism to benefit the local population.

The Bureau:

- (i) congratulated the Mali authorities for the efforts undertaken to preserve this site inscribed on the World Heritage List;
- (ii) invited the Mali authorities, in accordance with paragraph 56 of the « Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention » to: i) co-ordinate international assistance, and ii) inform the World Heritage Committee, through the UNESCO Secretariat, of their intentions to undertake or to authorize, within the area protected by the Convention, major restoration work;
- (iii) encouraged the authorities to implement awareness building activities among the population.

### **City of Cusco (Peru)**

The Bureau, at its twenty-first session, reiterated the need for appropriate planning mechanisms for the Historic City of Cusco. At that occasion, the Bureau welcomed the initiative to establish a Master Plan for the City but emphasized that in the process of its preparation and application arrangements should be made for the adequate co-ordination and collaboration between all institutions and authorities involved, particularly the National Institute for Culture and the Municipality of the City.

In November 1997, the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee approved an amount of US\$ 20,000 under Technical Co-operation for the preparation of the Master Plan. A contract to this effect was established with the National Institute for Culture. To date, however, this assistance could not be implemented due to the lack of appropriate co-ordination between the Institute and the Municipality. Concerns about this situation were brought to the attention of the Permanent Delegation of Peru on 2 October 1998. In the meantime, the Secretariat has received expressions of concern about the lack of planning, the lack of application of the urban ordinances for preservation and new constructions that are considered inappropriate.

The Bureau expressed its concern about the state of conservation of the City of Cusco and urged the national and local authorities to make adequate arrangements for the preparation and application of a Master Plan for the city. It also urged to consider interventions in public spaces as well as new construction and rehabilitation works in full respect of the urban, architectural and historic values that are represented in the city as well as international standards of intervention in historic urban areas.

The Bureau requested the Peruvian authorities to inform the Secretariat of the actions taken in response to the above by 15 April 1999 for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third session.

### **Archaeological site of Chavin (Peru)**

In 1998, Emergency Assistance was provided to the Peruvian National Institute for Culture for taking protective measures at

the archaeological site of Chavin against the possible impact of the El Niño phenomenon. The Emergency Assistance has enabled to improve the drainage system at the site and to improve the stability of the galleries in the temple, preventing their possible collapse.

The works at the site and a preliminary technical report from the expert who supervised the execution of the works show that this site had never been the subject of a specific conservation and maintenance programme and that the state of conservation of the major structures was very bad. The report identifies a great number of factors that possibly affect the site, such as climatic conditions, structural instability, topography, characteristics of the materials used in the construction, badly managed tourism etc.

The Bureau took note of the successful implementation of the Emergency Assistance for the site. It expressed concern, however, about the overall state of conservation of the site and encouraged the Secretariat and the advisory bodies to provide expertise to update the monitoring report prepared in 1993. This should enable the Peruvian authorities to draw up a project for the preparation of a comprehensive master plan for the site, making use of the expertise that has been obtained in the preparation of similar plans for other archaeological sites in Peru, such as Chan Chan.

### **Historic Centre of Lima (Peru)**

On 2 August 1998, a serious fire destroyed the municipal theatre of Lima located within the World Heritage site of the Historic Centre of Lima. The theatre was inaugurated in 1920.

In response, the Secretariat fielded an expert mission in order to assess the situation and to advise the municipal authorities on setting up a programme and action plan for the recuperation of the theatre.

The Bureau expressed its concern about the serious damages caused by fire to the municipal theatre of Lima. It recommended the national and local authorities to develop a rehabilitation scheme that respects the architectural and historical values of the building and that can serve as a catalyst for the recuperation of the urban surroundings of the theatre. It requested the authorities to keep the Secretariat informed about the progress made in this respect.

### **The Baroque Churches of the Philippines (The Philippines)**

The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-first extraordinary session, took note of the report of the Secretariat on the state of conservation of the San Agustín Church in Paoay and the request for international assistance submitted by the Government of The Philippines to organize a training workshop to raise public awareness and to ensure proper conservation measures to be undertaken to preserve the authenticity of the Baroque Churches. The Bureau recommended that the Government continues its efforts to safeguard this site and to report on the Government's restoration plan of the Church of San Agustín in Paoay, to the Committee at its twenty-second session. The requested report had not been received by the World Heritage Centre.

At the request of the Government, the World Heritage Centre sent an expert recommended by ICOMOS in July 1998 to the San Agustín Church of Intramuros Manila, one of the four Baroque Churches composing this World Heritage site. The

purpose of this mission was to evaluate whether or not a proposed plan for building an ossuary by the custodians of the San Augustin Church of Intramuros would affect the integrity and authenticity of the monument. The plan proposes to replace the original 159 crypt burials within the Sala de Profundis to a new ossuary to be built outside of the Church. According to the expert, this plan if implemented, would alter the original and authentic condition of the rear space of the monument. Furthermore, the displacement of the crypt burials of Sala de Profundis would change a historical event and evolution of the Church and was therefore discouraged.

The expert also analyzed the conservation practice at San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila and recommended that a long-term solution to control the flow of heavy rain water and appropriate conservation practices using traditional construction material be adopted by the custodians of this monument to ensure the structural stability of the Church.

The Bureau took note of the report of the expert, and expressed concern regarding the plan to remove the original crypt burials from the Sala de Profundis and to build a new ossuary at the San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila. The Bureau requested the national authorities to reconsider the proposed plan in order not to change the historical evolution of the Church, and that new design and land-use within the protected World Heritage site be carefully considered by all authorities concerned to ensure the authenticity of this important historical monument and the integrity of its setting. Furthermore, the Bureau advised the State Party to work with the World Heritage Centre to consider requesting international expertise on appropriate conservation practices using traditional building material to ensure the structural stability of the historical monument. Finally, the Bureau requested the national authorities to report to the Committee on the results of the training activities held at the Churches of Paoay and Santa Maria, the restoration plan for the Church of San Agustin of Paoay, and on the measures taken to ensure the integrity and authenticity of the San Augustin Church of Intramuros Manila, by 15 September 1999.

#### **Historic Centre of Porto (Portugal)**

The Bureau at its twenty-second session took note of a report on the impact of infrastructural works at the River Douro on the World Heritage values of the site of Porto.

In response, the State Party by letter dated 16 November 1998, informed that:

- the works would be undertaken at three kilometres distance from the World Heritage site
- due to the distance and the geography of the area they would not be visible from the World Heritage site
- at this moment no finances have been allocated and no date has been established for its execution.

The Bureau took note of the assurance from the Portuguese authorities that the works that would be undertaken in the River Douro in the vicinity of the World Heritage site of the Historic Centre of Porto would not have any impact on, nor would be visible from the World Heritage site.

#### **Island of Gorée (Senegal)**

The International Campaign for the Safeguarding of the Island of Gorée has as its objective the rehabilitation of the heritage

and the socio-economic revitalization of the Island, the principal tourist destination in Senegal.

The preservation of the architectural heritage is linked to the protection of the natural environment (coastal areas) and the improvement of the infrastructure (water, sewers, refuse disposal, etc.). Specific priority projects have been identified for implementation.

The Bureau congratulated the Senegalese authorities for the efforts undertaken to preserve the Island of Gorée and its rehabilitation and socio-economic revitalization, taking into consideration the natural environment and the improvement of infrastructure; it also invited the international community to support the efforts undertaken by the Senegalese authorities.

#### **Sacred City of Anuradhapura (Sri Lanka) Ancient City of Polonnaruwa (Sri Lanka) Ancient City of Sigiriya (Sri Lanka)**

ICOMOS monitoring missions to these three World Heritage sites in Sri Lanka were undertaken in November – December 1994. The final and comprehensive report of this mission was submitted by ICOMOS in July 1998, due to a series of unavoidable events which led to the delay in the completion of the report. The preparation of the report was also considered by ICOMOS as a process for the establishment of general parameters for future monitoring reports, which could possibly serve as guidelines for the World Heritage Committee. The report will be made available upon request by the World Heritage Centre for consultation at the twenty-second session of the World Heritage Committee. The report was submitted to the Government of Sri Lanka by ICOMOS in July 1998.

The report of the ICOMOS monitoring mission recommends a 10-point general recommendation for enhanced management and adequate protection of the three World Heritage sites, with a final recommendation that the concerned authorities refer to the 10 points as a guide in structuring periodic monitoring activities. The report also presents numerous recommendations concerning issues of management, planning, legal protection, conservation practice, training, tourism development, documentation, monitoring and presentation, as well as site-specific recommendations.

Amongst the comprehensive information and various recommendations presented in the report, ICOMOS experts noted that the area surrounding the rock of the outer moat at the Ancient City of Sigiriya site, which clearly was intended to be included in the original 1984 nomination dossier, is not indicated on the map of the nomination file. ICOMOS recommended that this be officially included in the protected area and that the World Heritage Committee be officially notified of the boundaries of the Ancient City of Sigiriya site. ICOMOS also reported that the complex water-management system, one of the most significant elements of the ancient landscape of Polonnaruwa, is not specifically listed in the original 1984 nomination form. Particularly alarming at the Ancient City of Polonnaruwa site, for which no buffer zones are fixed, was the construction of new buildings without specific design guidelines taking place in half of the city. Furthermore, ICOMOS noted that the boundaries delineated on the official map of the Sacred City of Anuradhapura exclude important areas of the World Heritage site.

Therefore, ICOMOS recommended that the Government of Sri Lanka submit to the World Heritage Committee, maps for all



three properties clearly indicating the core and buffer zones of each site. These maps should be accompanied by explanatory material concerning each monument within each zone, also indicating the protection afforded to the monuments and areas protected. ICOMOS also recommended that copies of relevant management plans for individual projects and the corresponding development plans be transmitted to the World Heritage Committee through the World Heritage Centre.

The Bureau took note of the comprehensive ICOMOS report of the three sites in Sri Lanka and requested the Government of Sri Lanka to submit maps of the three sites, clearly indicating the core and buffer zones of each, accompanied by an inventory of all the religious and secular monuments, historically significant buildings and landscape elements within the core and buffer zones of the sites with explanatory information. Furthermore, the Bureau requested that copies of legislation and relevant management plans which ensure the protection of these zones be submitted to the World Heritage Committee by 15 September 1999. Finally, the Bureau requested the Government to submit a report to the World Heritage Committee concerning the actions taken to address the concerns and recommendations of ICOMOS following the monitoring mission, before 15 September 1999, especially concerning the building control within and surrounding the sites.

#### **Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic)**

In December 1997, the mission sent by the Secretariat to study the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon had recommended that an overall management plan should be prepared for the site of Palmyra. The Syrian authorities have requested the Secretariat to prepare detailed terms of reference for the management plan. A specialist visited the site in August 1998 and, in close co-operation with the Directorate General for Antiquities and Museums of Syria and with the assistance of the Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient (IFAPO), prepared detailed terms of reference for the management plan which encompasses the archaeological site and the oasis and town of Palmyra, which are intertwined. Meanwhile, the authorities have already taken important protection measures, such as the diversion of the international road crossing the site.

The Bureau congratulates the Syrian authorities for their commitment in the conservation of the important site of Palmyra. It supported the continuation of the work for the development of a full-fledged integral management plan covering the oasis, the town and the archaeological zone. It also thanks the IFAPO for its involvement and the UNDP for its interest. It finally requests the Secretariat to continue its work to develop, starting early in 1999, the management plan of Palmyra. It therefore recommends the Syrian authorities to submit as soon as possible a request for international assistance to this effect.

#### **Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey)**

##### **The Monument of Hagia Sophia of the Archaeological Park**

In 1993, an expert mission visited Hagia Sophia, one of the main monuments of the World Heritage Historic Areas of Istanbul. A series of recommendations for its rehabilitation elaborated by the UNESCO mission in 1993 was approved by the Government of Turkey, who subsequently increased its budgetary allocation for their implementation. In March 1998 another mission visited the monument and stressed the need for an advisory body of

international and national experts which can meet regularly to advise the national team composed of the Hagia Sophia Museum and the Central Conservation and Restoration Laboratory, in charge of the restoration of this monument. It also noted that the restoration of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia for which the World Heritage Fund has contributed US\$ 80,000 between 1983 and 1994, was progressing satisfactorily. To increase the rhythm of the work, the Central Laboratory has requested additional human and financial resources (request to be considered under International Assistance).

##### **The Zeyrek Conservation Site**

With regard to the Zeyrek Conservation Site in Fatih District of Istanbul which is protected as part of the World Heritage area for the value of the Ottoman epoch timber buildings, the State Party submitted in May 1998, a Technical Co-operation request. This request concerned a detailed technical evaluation and the preparation of the repair schedules of these historic timber buildings, following the alarming report presented by ICOMOS to the twenty-second session of the Bureau. This request also included activities to support the Municipality of Fatih to establish a Fatih Heritage House, a service to advise the inhabitants of Fatih (including Zeyrek) of the housing improvement and conservation methods of the historic buildings, the majority of which are under private ownership. The Secretariat reported to the Bureau at its twenty-second ordinary session held in June 1998 that the urgency of these activities was due to the need to convince the European Union not to exclude Zeyrek from its rehabilitation project aimed at housing improvement, despite the fact that the majority of the Ottoman epoch buildings in Zeyrek had been abandoned by the inhabitants due to their dangerous condition. The Bureau decided to postpone its decision concerning the grant of this request to its extraordinary session in November 1998 and to await additional information. The UNESCO/EC project office and the ICOMOS expert who undertook another reactive monitoring mission in October 1998, reconfirmed the need for urgent measures to (a) prevent the further loss of these Ottoman epoch buildings by at least providing emergency shoring to avoid their collapse; (b) carry out training in conservation skills to stop the use of cement and inappropriate material in the restoration/reconstruction work being carried out on some of these buildings by the private sector; and (c) mobilize the Fatih Heritage House to undertake actions to organize the inhabitants to invest the required self-financing component in the co-funding scheme for housing improvement under the EU/Turkish Government programme, expected to become operational by September 1999.

The Bureau, having noted the State Party's request for UNESCO to establish a team of national and international experts to strengthen the on-going effort for the restoration of the mosaics of Hagia Sophia, recommended the Government to organize, in close collaboration with the Secretariat, an international expert meeting to take stock of the actions accomplished and to draw up a medium-term plan of action for the continuation of the work and to prepare the terms of reference for the international experts required by the Central Laboratory.

The Bureau expressed concern over the state of conservation of the Ottoman epoch timber buildings in Zeyrek as reported by ICOMOS and the Secretariat and requested the State Party to inform the Secretariat by 15 April 1999, for examination by the Bureau at its twenty-third ordinary session, on measures it intends to take for the preservation of this important site which

forms an integral part of the World Heritage Historic Areas of Istanbul. The Bureau furthermore, requested the Secretariat to maintain close collaboration with the European Commission and the Fatih Municipality to maximize the benefits of the EU-funded project in Fatih for the rehabilitation of historic buildings in the World Heritage protected areas.

#### **Kiev: Saint Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)**

At its twenty-second ordinary session, the Bureau requested the Government of Ukraine to reconsider its hotel-building policy and specific hotel projects in respect of their historical context. It requested the authorities to submit a report on this matter by 15 September 1998 at the latest.

The State Party informed the Secretariat on 14 September 1998 that the above-mentioned projects were repeatedly considered by the experts of Ukraine and were discussed by the local and central authorities as well as by ICOMOS Ukraine. As a result, the project of the hotel "Kiev-International" was decreased in height to the level of the existing surrounding buildings. Furthermore, the construction of the nearby "Laboratory House" project, which did not correspond to the surrounding architectural environment of the Cathedral, was suspended pending the preparation of a new proposal.

On 31 August 1998, the State Party also informed the Secretariat on the proposed reconstruction of the *Dormition Cathedral* in *Pechersk-Lavra* that, according to other sources, could cause problems to the surrounding buildings due to the unstable and geologically difficult terrain. It was stated that the reconstruction project would be carried out on the basis of a complex geological and engineering research, which offers the opportunity to select the optimal engineering and constructive solution. The State Party asked the Secretariat for advice in this matter.

ICOMOS stated that the final designs of the hotel buildings should still be reviewed and confirmed that open excavation pits at the site of the Cathedral, undertaken to research the geology of the soil, now pose dangers to the stability of the area. Expert assistance on the rehabilitation of the subsoil should be obtained without delay. Any further excavation in this area should be carried out according to accepted archaeological principles.

The Bureau took note of the information provided by the State Party on the projects for the construction of hotels in the city of Kiev and the proposed reconstruction of the *Dormition Cathedral* in *Pechersk-Lavra*. It also noted the advice of ICOMOS that the final designs of the hotels should be verified and in-depth hydro-geological studies should be undertaken at the site of the *Dormition Cathedral*. The Bureau requested ICOMOS to field an expert mission to this effect.

#### **Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam)**

The World Heritage Committee, at its the twenty-first session noted the concerns raised by the Bureau over the increasing cases of inappropriate reconstruction and new construction activities taking place in some parts of Zone 1 and more noticeably in Zone 2 of the World Heritage protected area of the Complex of Hué Monuments. The deformation to the historic urban pattern, renowned for its "garden houses" built respecting the traditional spatial organization of "feng shui", is caused primarily by the densification of land-use to accommodate the increase in family size after the end of the Vietnam War. The

deformation of the historic townscape of Hué is also caused by inappropriate designs of houses being renovated or newly constructed which do not use traditional construction material nor are built in a style harmonious to the historic environment of the site.

With the international technical co-operation grant provided from the World Heritage Fund in 1998, a legal audit was conducted as part of the Hué-Lille-UNESCO joint project which has confirmed the weakness or the non-existence of some essential regulations. A proposal of provisional land-use regulations and general building guidelines are currently being drafted for consideration by the competent local and national authorities. The Heritage House (*Maison du patrimoine*), an advisory service for local inhabitants aimed to involve them in heritage conservation in the process of housing improvement, is expected to begin operations in March 1999 upon completion of the rehabilitation of a historic house to be used as the office. This rehabilitation and the architectural survey being conducted in five pilot project sites, have involved the mobilization of some 50 students of the Department of Architecture of Hué University over a period of six months under the technical supervision of Vietnamese professors and French architect-urbanists from the School of Architecture of Lille. These activities are financed by Lille Metropole and the French Foreign Ministry with catalytic financial input from the World Heritage Fund and being carried out within the framework of the decentralized co-operation agreement signed in November 1997 between between Lille Metropole (France) and Hué Provincial and Municipal Authorities under the aegis of UNESCO. Complementary activities in urban landscape protection and training of two Vietnamese professors of architecture in Lille are being financed and conducted by the Region Nord Pas de Calais in consultations with the Hué-Lille-UNESCO team. Close collaboration is also being maintained with the French DATAR team working on the regional development scheme to ensure that the upgrading of National Route No. 1 which cuts across the World Heritage site between the Citadel and the Imperial Tomb area, will not undermine the integrity of the site. The Bureau was informed that with funds made available in 1998 by the Committee, the Provincial Authority of Hué with support from the Vietnamese National Commission for UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre, will be organizing a donors' information meeting in Hanoi in March 1999 to co-ordinate international co-operation and development activities in Hué.

The Bureau encouraged the continued efforts of the Provincial and Municipal Authorities of Hué and the Hué Conservation Centre with technical support of Lille and UNESCO in mitigating the threat to Hué caused by inappropriate building design and densification of land-use. The Bureau requested the State Party to submit a written report to the Committee through the World Heritage Centre by 15 September 1999 on progress made in the elaboration and application of provisional regulations concerning the urban design and land-use in Zones 1 and 2 of the Hué World Heritage site.

#### **Old City of Sana'a (Yemen)**

A monitoring mission visited the site in June 1998 and found that there was obvious need of co-ordination between the various governmental bodies involved in the city as well as between the World Bank project team and the General Organization for the Preservation of the Historic Cities in Yemen (GOPHCY). The responsible national authorities requested the members of the mission to assist in establishing a new scheme in order to define the roles of various international

and national bodies. The mission recommended that UNESCO create a new focal point to co-ordinate preservation activities in Sana'a.

After having taken note of the report of the Secretariat, the Bureau requested the Centre to assist the Yemeni authorities in establishing a focal point in Sana'a and provide technical assistance to prepare an overall management plan for the city.

## Statement by the Delegate of Thailand on the Thung Yai-Huay Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries

Mr Chairman,

I was somewhat disturbed by the statement in the first sentence in terms of the totality of the Wildlife Sanctuary. The forest fire that was referred to occurred only in a confined area of dry deciduous dipterocarp forest, where fire is a function of the ecosystem. Besides, last year's fire was much less in extent than the one of five years ago.

The World Heritage site is the largest in the mainland Southeast Asia, consisting of four ecosystems : Sundaic, Indo-Burmese, Sino-Himalayan and Indo-Chinese.

One of the Indo-Chinese forest types is the dry dipterocarp forest which is located on the rim of the eastern part of this site not far from the outside resort where the workshop was organized.

Forest fires in this type of forest are surface fires and the forest trees are fire resistant. In this type of forest ecosystem, surface fires reduce ground litter of leaves and branches and make it possible for the seeds of the trees to germinate. Surface fires also function as the natural and effective means of biological control of insects and disease infestations. The exposure of the soil by fires allows grasses and new brush to grow to feed the wildlife.

It is true that most fires in this area resulted from carelessness of the farmers outside the buffer zones and thus undesirable and haphazard.

It is my considered opinion that complete fire exclusion, which the text on page 23 seems to suggest, is most likely to bring about undesirable changes in vegetation pattern and will also certainly allow accumulation of fuel on the ground forest with increased potential catastrophic fires.

For the above ecological reasons, I have been advocating the use of fires as a tool in forest land management of the dipterocarp forest or even the mixed deciduous forests. In the management plan for such ecosystems, prescribed burning can be used under carefully controlled conditions to remove unwanted debris, to keep fuels from accumulating and to favour tree seedling. Since most grasses and shrubs grow well after fires, and animals are attracted to the tender and nutritious new growth, such prescribed fires benefit both wildlife and the mosaic vegetation of different ages that result from frequent fires and will favour a rich diversity of plant and animal life.

Thank you.

## **Presentation by Professor F. Francioni (Italy) concerning the World Heritage mission to Kakadu National Park (Australia), 26 October-1 November 1998**

I wish to thank the Chairperson and the Committee for the opportunity to report on the main findings and recommendations of the mission to Kakadu. I again draw the attention of the Committee to the mission report provided as information document WHC-98/CONF.203/INF.18.

### **SUMMARY REPORT**

On October 26 to 1 November I led a mission to Kakadu National Park to determine and describe any ascertained and potential threats to the World Heritage values of the Park, particularly in relation to possible threats arising from the Jabiluka uranium mining proposal.

Several days ago I gave a presentation to the Bureau which outlined the mandate, organisation and membership of the mission, and the process of report preparation. My remarks are included in the Bureau report WHC-98/CONF.203/5.

At that time I expressed my thanks to the Australian authorities for their co-operation in organising and facilitating the mission. I also expressed my sincere thanks to the six other members of the mission team - Mr Bernd von Droste (Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre), Dr Patrick Dugan (IUCN), Dr Patricia Parker (ICOMOS), Dr John Cook (US National Park Service) and two Australian nationals, Professor Jon Altman and Dr Roy Green.

The mission report focuses primarily on ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage values of Kakadu National Park posed by the Jabiluka mining proposal, and presents 16 recommendations.

The mission concluded that there are severe ascertained and potential dangers to the cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka. The mission therefore recommended that the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed. (Recommendation 1).

**FIRST OVERHEAD** (Map of Kakadu National Park showing the three stages of inscription on the World Heritage List)

You will recall that Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List in three stages - Stage I in 1981, Stage II in 1987, and Stage III in 1992. The site is inscribed on the basis of its cultural and natural values.

The Park's cultural World Heritage values relate to its outstanding rock art sites, archaeological sites and sites of spiritual importance to Aboriginal Traditional Owners. The archaeological remains and rock art of the Kakadu region represent an outstanding example of people's interaction with the natural environment. The cultural sites exhibit great antiquity and have a continuous temporal span ranging from tens of thousands of years ago to the present. At the same time, they also form part of a living cultural tradition which continues today amongst the Traditional Aboriginal owners and custodians of the area.

The park is extensive and is located in the monsoonal tropical environment of Northern Australia. The Park contains features of great natural beauty and magnificent, sweeping landscapes of World Heritage value. The focal points are the internationally important wetlands and the spectacular escarpment and its rocky outliers.

**SECOND OVERHEAD** (Map showing the location of the Ranger, Jabiluka and Koongarra Mineral Leases)

There are three Mineral Leases in enclaves within Kakadu National Park. One of these enclaves includes an open cut uranium mine known as Ranger which has been in operation for 18 years and is expected to continue operating for another seven or eight years.

**FIRST SLIDE** (Aerial view of Ranger uranium mine)

The current proposal to mine uranium at Jabiluka would therefore see two uranium mines operating in the Kakadu region at the same time.

The Australian government informed the mission, as it has done at recent sessions of the Committee and the Bureau, that the procedures followed for the Environmental Impact Assessment of the Jabiluka mining proposal were in accordance with legal requirements, and provided the opportunity for public and expert inputs. The Australian authorities have provided information of the more than 70 environmental protection conditions that have been placed on the mining proponent.

There has been some debate over the processes adopted to evaluate the proposal for the Jabiluka mine and the options for milling the ore from Jabiluka on-site or alternatively at Ranger, 22 km away. The mission was concerned by claims that there had been a recent diminution in environmental controls for the Jabiluka mine.

The Australian government has decided that all tailings – the pulverized residues left after extraction of the uranium – from the Jabiluka mining proposal would be stored underground. Furthermore, the government has assessed two options for the milling of the ore proposed to be extracted from Jabiluka. These are known as the Jabiluka Milling Alternative (JMA) and Ranger Milling Alternative (RMA).

The mission recognised that the RMA would have less direct impact on the Jabiluka area but that this would require building a road joining Jabiluka to Ranger and this road has been opposed by the senior traditional owner because of fundamental opposition to mining. Despite not being the preferred environmental option, ERA is currently planning to install a mill to process the uranium ore at Jabiluka.

Despite the concern expressed by the twenty-second session of the Bureau which met in June, at that time construction of the Jabiluka mine commenced. The Bureau had noted that "Uranium mining in an area of high natural and cultural values is of sensitivity and concern".

The following photographs show the status of the construction of the uranium mine at Jabiluka at the end of October 1998. The Jabiluka mine, unlike the open cut uranium mine at Ranger, is an underground mine. However, the underground mine requires significant surface works and facilities. You will see that a mine portal provides an entrance to the 1,800 metre mine decline currently under construction. The retention pond is already apparent.

SLIDE 2 JABILUKA MINE FROM THE DISTANCE – ROCKY OUTLIERS IN THE DISTANCE INCLUDE ROCK ART SITES

SLIDE 3 CLOSER VIEW CLEARLY SHOWING RETENTION POND. THE MINE PORTAL CAN BE SEEN AT THE BOTTOM OF THE SCREEN

SLIDE 4 CLEARER DETAIL OF THE MINE PORTAL FROM WHERE THE 1,800 METRE SHAFT WILL BE EXCAVATED

SLIDE 5 VIEW LOOKING TOWARDS THE RETENTION POND

The mission was concerned that the construction of a mine, and mining of uranium, at Jabiluka have been presented to the Committee as a *fait accompli* and commented that it is relevant to note that Paragraph 56 of the *Operational Guidelines* clearly states States Parties should inform the Committee ... of their intention to undertake or to authorize major restorations or new constructions which may affect World Heritages values ... and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse ..."

The mission seriously questioned the compatibility of mining, and particularly uranium mining and milling, in such close proximity, and upstream from, a World Heritage property, and regarded the Jabiluka mine as contributing threats which are posing both ascertained and potential dangers to the cultural and natural values of the World Heritage property.

#### Scientific uncertainties and the need for risk assessment

The mission determined that there are three issues of scientific uncertainty that lead to a finding of potential danger: (i) the degree of uncertainty concerning the quality of the hydrological modeling carried out in designing the water management plan for the mine site; (ii) the degree of uncertainty concerning the effectiveness of the concrete pasting process as a means of storing the tailings in the mine void, and (iii) the possible impacts on catchment ecosystems.

The mission concluded that application of the Precautionary Principle requires that mining operations at Jabiluka be ceased. (Recommendation 2).

#### Visual impact

The mission recognized that the location of the mine site in an enclave within the Park boundaries, and in particular in the area between the escarpment and the Magela floodplain, diminishes the natural beauty of the magnificent, sweeping landscapes of internationally important wetlands and adjacent escarpment. This present impact will be increased further should the road from Jabiluka to Ranger be constructed as currently proposed (RMA - Ranger Milling Alternative) or, alternatively, should the uranium ore to be extracted from Jabiluka be milled at the mine site (JMA - Jabiluka Milling Alternative).

The view was expressed to the mission that the visual impact of the underground mine at Jabiluka is insignificant when compared with the open cut mine Ranger which I showed as my first slide. The Jabiluka mine site is readily visible from the air from where visitors making overflights are especially well able to appreciate the sweeping landscapes for which Kakadu was inscribed on the World Heritage List and is famous.

The mission therefore concluded that the visual impact of Jabiluka is a distinct and significant visual impact that constitutes an ascertained danger for the natural World Heritage values of Kakadu in that it constitutes a deterioration of the "natural beauty or scientific value of the property" as set out in Paragraph 79 (i)(b) of the *Operational Guidelines*. The mission recommended that further visual encroachment on the integrity of Kakadu National Park should be prevented. (Recommendation 3)

#### Dangers to the cultural values of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease

The Mission was informed of the anthropological and archaeological significance of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease. Despite the fact that the Jabiluka Mineral Lease is an enclave from Kakadu National Park, overwhelming and uncontested evidence provided to the mission indicated that the cultural heritage values of the Mineral Lease are at least the equal of the abutting National Park and World Heritage property.

The Jabiluka Mineral Lease is the location of a very important archaeological sites, known as Malakananja II used to justify the inclusion of Kakadu Stage III on the World Heritage List. "Grindstones, amongst the world's earliest evidence of this technique of food preparation" were discovered at the site and "some of the world's oldest evidence of the technology of edge-ground axes and the preparation of pigments of at least 13,000 years ago" have also been found at the site.

The mission was concerned that the cultural integrity of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease (and in particular of the Australian Heritage Commission areas including the Jabiluka Outlier and Malakananja II) is potentially under direct threat from the proximity and scale of the mine construction. This has the potential to impact on the cultural values of the adjoining World Heritage property. These threats would escalate as mine development proceeds and would include impact of dust and vibration on rock art and archaeological sites. The mission was made aware of control and monitoring processes now having been put in place in this regard and noted that a leading expert in this field is now being consulted by the Supervising Scientist.

The mission concluded that it is important that the cultural sites of local, regional, national and international significance located within the Jabiluka Mineral Lease are adequately protected to standards set by international best practice in cultural heritage management. Furthermore, the mission concluded that international best environmental practice and a precautionary approach must also extend to the protection of cultural values (Recommendation 4).

In this regard the mission noted the recent commencement of work on the Cultural Heritage Management Plan for the Jabiluka Mineral Lease. The Mission endorsed the Australian Government decision announced to it, to subject the Interim Cultural Heritage Management Plan to peer review. The Mission recommended that every effort be made to ensure thorough participation, negotiation and communication with traditional owners, custodians and managers to ensure the compilation of

an accurate cultural inventory that will lead to the conservation of the cultural sites located within the Jabiluka Mineral Lease.

### **The Bowyeg Djang (Gecko Dreaming) site**

The mission was informed of the general locality of the Bowyeg site – a site of mythological importance to the traditional owners of the Park. The site covers part of the valley where the mine and shaft are being developed.

This is causing concern to the Mirarr Aboriginal people, and in particular their senior spokesperson (Ms Yvonne Margarula). Given the scale and depth of the Jabiluka mine decline, and its underground proximity to the Bowyeg site, such concern was, in the view of the mission, understandable.

The mission reached a consensus opinion that the mining proponent should voluntarily suspend all activity that would directly or indirectly impact the areas proposed as encompassing the Bowyeg site. The Mission recommended, as an utmost priority, exhaustive cultural mapping of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease and the Bowyeg site and its boundaries to ensure protection of these integral elements and associative values of the outstanding cultural landscape of Kakadu (Recommendation 5).

### **Threats to the living cultural heritage of Kakadu**

The integrity of the World Heritage associative values recognized by the inclusion of Kakadu National Park on the World Heritage List on the basis of cultural criterion vi depends on the ability of affected Aboriginal communities to continue their traditional relationships to the land. The mission was of the opinion that this ability, and therefore the living cultural heritage values for which Kakadu National Park was inscribed, are demonstrably under threat. The living traditions are being directly and indirectly impacted by mining activity at Jabiluka and by other social and economic distresses.

In this regard, the mission recommended the immediate and effective implementation of the Kakadu Regional Social Impact Study to begin to ameliorate the negative regional socio-cultural impacts of development on Aboriginal people as these impacts are a potential danger to the cultural values recognised when Kakadu National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List according to cultural heritage criterion vi. (Recommendation 6)

The mission considered that Jabiluka serves as a critical threshold in the relationship between the Aboriginal people of Kakadu, and the impact of development infrastructure upon their country and beliefs, and therefore that any continuation or escalation of disputation on this issue has the potential to further fracture the regional Aboriginal polity, further undermine the living cultural heritage of indigenous people, and in particular the Mirrar, in the region.

In summary, the mission considered that the strongly held beliefs of the traditional owners must be respected to ensure the protection of the living cultural traditions recognised through World Heritage inscription. (Recommendation 7)

### **Lack of recognition of the Kakadu cultural landscape**

The mission was made constantly aware that the living cultural tradition of Kakadu, recognised through World Heritage inscription, is underpinned by the special relationship between the Aboriginal traditional owners and their land. However, at

the time of the December 1992 Stage III inscription of Kakadu National Park on the World Heritage List, Kakadu was not assessed or evaluated as a potential World Heritage cultural landscape as, at that time, the World Heritage cultural landscape categories had not yet been approved by the Committee. This point has been noted on a number of occasions, most recently by ICOMOS at the twenty-second session of the Bureau in June 1998.

The mission heard of the support for the concept of World Heritage cultural landscapes from a number of stakeholders who described, in detail, the particular relevance of the concept to the recognition and conservation of the intense connectedness between the traditional owners of Kakadu and their environment.

A number of stakeholders referred to the excision of the Jabiluka Mineral Lease from the area nominated to and inscribed on the World Heritage List as failing to reflect the views, perceptions and meanings of that area as an integral part of the regional cultural landscape and their living cultural traditions.

Recommendation 8 of the report states that the mission is of the opinion that the full extent of the outstanding cultural landscape of Kakadu should be recognised and protected.

### **Limitations to the boundaries of Kakadu National Park**

Whilst the mission acknowledged the extensive area of the National Park and World Heritage property (19,804 km<sup>2</sup>), the mission was in favour of the suggestions made in a number of submissions to extend the World Heritage property to include more of the catchment of the East Alligator River. Such an extension is vital to ensure the ecological integrity and conservation of the downstream wetlands which form the core of the World Heritage property. Without this protection, the ecological integrity of the Kakadu region, including the existing World Heritage property, is in potential danger as the possibility of additional mining projects commencing in the upper catchment has not been excluded. (see Recommendation 9)

### **Threat to the continuation of the "joint management" regime at Kakadu National Park**

In 1989 a Board of Management was established for Kakadu National Park. The Board is composed of 14 people including 10 Aboriginal people nominated by the traditional owners of the Park.

The "joint management" of Kakadu by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people has been widely praised as a model for cross-cultural stewardship of a protected area.

Recommendation 10 of the mission report in noting the proposed changes to environmental legislation in Australia refers to the need to ensure that a clear two-thirds majority for Aboriginal membership of the Board is maintained.

### **Overall breakdown in trust and communication**

Furthermore, the mission report refers to the importance in maintaining trust and communication between all indigenous and non-indigenous stakeholders with an interest in the Kakadu region and encourages increased cross-cultural dialogue to ensure conservation of the outstanding heritage values of Kakadu for future generations. (Recommendation 11)

I will now move quickly to the final recommendations of the mission report.

Recommendation 12 also refers to the need to develop stronger community trust of, and communication with, the Supervising Scientist's Group.

### **The Koongarra Mineral Lease**

The mission recommended that all efforts be made to seek the agreement with the traditional owners to include the third Mineral Lease, the Koongarra Mineral Lease, in the Park and therefore preclude mining.

### **The town of Jabiru**

The mining and tourism town of Jabiru is located within the World Heritage property.

The mission questioned the compatibility of the incremental development and expansion of the town of Jabiru with World Heritage conservation (see Recommendation 14)

The final section of the report refer to successes in the control of invasive plant and animal species in the Park and the final recommendations (Recommendations 15 and 16) include a recommendation calling for additional necessary funds and resources for their control and eradication.

### **Bureau recommendations**

In conclusion, I would like to refer briefly to the recommendations of the twenty second extraordinary session of the Bureau held at the end of last week that are included in document (WHC-98/CONF.203/8 REV.) . I urge you to examine the Bureau's recommendations *in extenso*.

The Bureau recognised the report of the mission to Kakadu National Park as being both thorough and credible.

The recommendations of the Bureau are made in two parts and include a preamble that expresses in the first instance, grave concern at the ascertained and potential dangers to the World Heritage cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park which, as noted in the mission report, are posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka.

The Bureau also noted with concern that in spite of the dangers to the World Heritage values, construction of the mine at Jabiluka began earlier this year and is currently progressing.

The Bureau calls for extensive reports on the state of conservation of Kakadu to be examined by the twenty-third session of the Bureau, and if the Bureau considers that the threats described in the mission report persist, it is recommended that the Bureau be authorized by the Committee to immediately inscribe Kakadu National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Final statement**

Finally, let me again recall the main recommendation of the mission report.

The mission concluded that there are severe ascertained and potential dangers to the cultural and natural values of Kakadu National Park posed primarily by the proposal for uranium mining and milling at Jabiluka. The mission therefore recommended that the proposal to mine and mill uranium at Jabiluka should not proceed. (Recommendation 1 of the report).

Thank you.



**JOINT ICOMOS AND IUCN POSITION STATEMENT –  
KAKADU NATIONAL PARK, AUSTRALIA**

**TWENTY SECOND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, KYOTO,  
JAPAN, 30 NOVEMBER – 4 DECEMBER 1998**

ICOMOS and IUCN have reviewed the report of the Kakadu Review Mission, together with the submissions provided to the Mission. ICOMOS and IUCN applaud the Australian Government for agreeing to receive the Mission and thank the wide range of stakeholders for their professional submissions.

ICOMOS and IUCN are aware that the preparation of the Report was constrained by the limited time available for all Mission members to work together and notes that this was a consequence of the change in dates of the Mission.

In commenting on the Kakadu situation in June 1998, IUCN noted that on issues of major significance, IUCN's approach is derived *inter alia* from the periodic World Conservation Congresses. Resolution 1.104 dealing with "Conservation of Kakadu World Heritage Site, Australia" was adopted by the World Conservation Congress at its 1st Session in Montreal, Canada, 14-23 October 1996. A copy of this Resolution was provided to the Bureau in June and is available separately.

ICOMOS endorses the concerns expressed by this Resolution. The Jabiluka mine constitutes a serious threat to the cultural significance of the entire Kakadu World Heritage site, and specifically to the profound associative values of this outstanding cultural landscape. Moreover, the rock art and occupation sites in the mining enclave are of great archaeological importance, and at the same time the sacred sites form an integral part of the living cultural traditions of the Aboriginal traditional owners.

The action section of the WCC Resolution 1.104 includes *inter alia* the provision:

"To urge the Government of Australia to prevent the development of Jabiluka and Koongarra uranium mines should it be shown that such mining would threaten the Park's World Heritage values."

On the basis of these considerations the position of ICOMOS and IUCN on the issue of Kakadu and mining can be summed up as follows:

1. The report of the Review Mission adds to the concerns discussed in June by analysing and listing a set of ascertained and potential threats to both the cultural and natural values for which Kakadu was listed as a World Heritage site.
2. On the basis of this analysis and WCC Resolution 1.104, ICOMOS and IUCN consider that the recommendations of the Review Mission should be addressed as a matter of urgency.
3. After careful consideration of the issues raised by the Review, ICOMOS and IUCN believe that the conditions exist for inscribing Kakadu on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
4. ICOMOS and IUCN believe that Kakadu is a threshold issue for the World Heritage Convention, one that can confirm the standards for which the World Heritage Convention enjoys such high international prestige, or one that can diminish these standards. We believe that failure to recognise the dangers identified in the report of the Review mission and to implement its recommendations will diminish these standards and risks prejudicing that prestige.
5. ICOMOS and IUCN believes this to be of particular concern at a time in the Conventions history when, as discussed in the Bureau on 27-28 November, the pressures on World Heritage sites are growing, and mining in particular is bringing such serious impacts.

30 November 1998

## **ANNEX VI.3**

### **FIRST STATEMENT BY DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA ON COMMITTEE DECISION CONCERNING KAKADU NATIONAL PARK**

Australia has not stood in the path of the consensus to adopt the Bureau's recommendations. Australia recognises the concerns of many delegations and the work that the Bureau has done to move this matter forward.

The matters are of considerable complexity and sensitivity. They need to be handled from here in a manner which reflects the values, procedures and provisions of the Convention.

As Professor Francioni has emphasised this mine is not in the World Heritage Area protected under the Convention for the purposes of Guideline 56 and cannot be seen from the World Heritage Area. There has been no breach of Guideline 56.

While Australia cannot associate itself with some of the Bureau's conclusions and judgments, it will undertake to provide the reports and reviews requested by the Committee.

Some of you are concerned about the urgency of the issue.

There are some brief remarks I would like to make that will deal with those concerns. I draw your attention to Roman (iii) of the preamble to the Bureau's recommendations. This sets out our undertakings in relation to advancing aspects of the Mission's recommendations in the time immediately ahead.

I also want to put beyond doubt the status of current works in the mining lease area, none of which is included in the World Heritage Area. The construction of the mine portal, or opening, and decline, or tunnel, which were well underway at the time of the Mission's visit will proceed and continue to be subject to intense environmental and cultural heritage supervision. The Australian Government will not permit damage to any cultural, art or archaeological sites from the mine development. The Company has agreed that there will be no constructions or activities at Boyweg. There will be a minimum impact on natural conservation values in the lease area and progressive rehabilitation of the works site. No mine development works are occurring, or will be allowed to occur, in the World Heritage Area. The development works will not impact on the physical attributes of the World Heritage area. The construction phase of the mine will not be completed until 2000.

The next stages of the mine development, ie mining of uranium ore and the construction of any mill to process ore is dependent on the assurance of an issue of export licences by the Australian Government. Issue of export licences, which is an essential commercial precondition to exploitation of uranium, requires the company satisfying more than 100 environmental requirements. This will definitely not take place before June next year; ie not until after the Australian Government has before it the results of the process that the Bureau has recommended to the Committee.

Let me reiterate that Australia stands by the Convention and does not intend to allow any damage to the natural and cultural values of the World Heritage area. We do not consider that the values are in any form of ascertained or potential danger.

Accordingly we do not believe that there is a basis now for urgent action. However, we have listened carefully to the views of Parties expressed through the decision of the Committee at the Bureau and in the corridors; and we will provide our informed analysis of the Mission report, as well as the reports and reviews requested by the Committee in the timetable outlined.

As I have already remarked, we are committed to this Convention. We are committed to its values and our obligations under the Convention. In addition, it is important that we all respect the rights of parties under the Convention, and in turn that the Convention's organs proceed in a manner which is both fair and legally well based.

We will return to these general procedural issues at an appropriate time.

We are grateful for the time and effort that delegations have devoted to this issue to find a way forward.

## **ANNEX VI.4**

### **SECOND STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA ON THE COMMITTEE DECISION CONCERNING KAKADU NATIONAL PARK**

Chairman

I must dissociate my Government from this resolution.

The Australian Government's position is that there is no basis on which it could or should suspend the construction works currently underway.

The Australian Governments response to the Committee's previous resolution will be prepared as requested and will provide the necessary information.

The Australian Government does not believe that the underground construction work scheduled for the next six months poses actual or potential threat to Kakadu's World Heritage values.

I will, of course, transmit this resolution to my Government and to the company.

I would like to add that we have always recognised the fundamental importance of ensuring thorough and continuing participation, negotiation and communication with Aboriginal traditional owners, custodians and managers in the conservation of the outstanding heritage values of Kakadu for future generations.

**STATEMENT BY POLAND RELATIVE  
TO THE INSCRIPTION OF  
CLASSICAL WEIMAR (GERMANY)**

La Pologne félicite l'Allemagne pour son initiative d'inscription de Weimar classique sur la Liste du patrimoine de l'humanité et appuie fortement cette demande.

Weimar, la capitale spirituelle de l'Europe à la fin du XVIIIème et au début du XIXème siècle, le domicile de deux des plus grands poètes du Romantisme –Goethe et Schiller – restera pour toujours un symbole d'une symbiose fructueuse entre la politique et la culture, entre le pouvoir et le savoir, se matérialisant dans un magnifique paysage urbain, caractérisé par de superbes monuments historiques. Ainsi, Weimar est devenu un lien spirituel et en même temps un bien matériel.

A l'époque de l'unification de l'Europe et des dialogues entre les grandes cultures du monde, les idées humanistes lancées par ces grands poètes-penseurs deviennent le message pour nous tous. Ainsi, l'exemple du Weimar aux XVIIIème et XIXème siècles peut nous aider en construction de notre future.

**STATEMENT BY POLAND RELATIVE  
TO THE INSCRIPTION OF  
L'VIV (UKRAINE)**

La République de Pologne accueille avec satisfaction l'initiative du Gouvernement de la République d'Ukraine de déposer la requête pour l'inscription de la vieille Ville de Lwow/ Lviv sur la Liste du patrimoine culturel mondial et appuie instamment cette demande.

La ville de Lwow/Lviv constitue un maillon très important unissant l'histoire de la Pologne et de l'Ukraine, et possède une importance toute particulière pour la culture de nos deux nations. Cette ville a une importance de caractère universel, en tant qu'exemple unique de la compénétration réciproque des influences culturelles et artistiques confluant dans cette ville de divers centres culturels d'Europe occidentale et orientale ainsi que d'Asie Mineure et du Proche-Orient.

En tant que patrimoine culturel commun, reconnu tel par l'UNESCO, il contribuera certainement au resserrement des liens d'amitié et de coopération entre les restaurateurs polonais et ukrainiens.

**STATEMENT BY GREECE ON AUTHENTICITY**

En ce qui concerne la recommandation de l'Organe consultatif sur l'authenticité, nous voudrions souligner que l'authenticité est une notion complexe et l'emploi du mot « authenticité », non assorti d'une spécification appropriée, est vide de toute signification valable.

Aucun monument ancien n'est « authentique » dans le sens absolu et complet du terme. Tous ont subi, au cours de leur longue existence, des altérations ou des restaurations de nature diverse.

Seule une approche plus analytique permet de juger l'ampleur du lien entre l'œuvre d'art ancienne et la vérité formelle et historique.

Une vaste réflexion sur le thème prenant en compte des différences et les nuances des cultures permettra de clarifier bientôt une notion aujourd'hui utilisée, mais marquée par une ambiguïté qui ne peut être que défavorable à une bonne politique de sauvegarde.

Dans le même cadre, la Grèce organise également l'année prochaine une table ronde d'experts de l'Europe du Sud sur le sujet de l'usage des monuments anciens comme lieux de spectacles contemporains. A notre avis, ce sujet, qui constitue un aspect de l'authenticité, permettra d'examiner dans quelle mesure cet usage tend à causer la dévaluation des monuments ou même créer des dangers pour leur propre existence.

## STATEMENT BY THE FORMER CHAIRPERSON RELATING TO A TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ASSISTANCE REQUEST FOR TURKEY AND ANNEX A OF WHC-98/CONF.203/14REV

### Statement

The statement by the Chairperson of the 22nd extraordinary session of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee, 27-28 November 1998, Professor Francesco Francioni related to a Technical Co-operation Assistance request for Turkey. The specific request concerned the Zeyrek conservation site, one of the protected monument zones of Historic Areas of Istanbul. The following statement was made by Professor Francioni during discussions concerning the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural sites at that session of the Bureau.

#### Chairperson Francioni:

“You may remember that there was discussion in the Bureau in June [1998] about the exact location of the Zeyrek site. There were representations made to the effect that it was not contained within the boundaries. I had some consultation with ICOMOS and I also [subsequently] received letters from [the] Representative of Turkey, to which I responded. I hope that we are able now to make a final determination. I received from the Secretariat, a voluminous dossier, but of course, I am not a land surveyor and I am not able to provide expert witness. I took note of that. I have the material, but I would like to refer to ICOMOS for the advice as to the proper location of this area; whether it would be reasonable in these circumstances to proceed with this recommendation in view of the discussions we had last June.”

#### ICOMOS:

“Yes.”

#### Chairperson Francioni:

“I would then put this decision to the Bureau. If the Bureau agrees, we shall proceed to remove the reservations that had emerged in June.” [The Bureau agreed.] “It is so decided.”

### WHC-98/CONF.203/14Rev. Annex A

Extract from the Report of the Rapporteur of the 22<sup>nd</sup> ordinary session of the Bureau, June 1998.

#### Turkey (Technical Co-operation for the “House of Fatih Inhabitants” within the Historic Centre of Istanbul)

The Chairperson noted that the request did not clearly show whether the State Party had submitted this request or not, noting that the Municipality of Fatih of Istanbul had prepared and submitted this project. In the same sense, the Observer of Argentina stated that international assistance requests, as well as proposals for nominations, should only be submitted by the competent national authorities representing States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. The Secretariat informed the Bureau that the request was prepared by the Municipality of Fatih (being the site management authority) and was submitted by the Turkish National Commission as well as the Permanent Delegation of Turkey to UNESCO, both official representatives of the Government of Turkey to UNESCO (under cover letters dated 25 May 1998 and 27 May 1998, respectively).

The Chairperson informed the Bureau that several delegates had questioned where the districts of Zeyrek, Fener and Balat were located within the Historic Centre of Istanbul site. He questioned the validity of approving international assistance requests for areas outside of the core zones of World Heritage sites. The Delegate of Japan noted that many sites inscribed on the World Heritage List in the early years of the Convention lacked adequate documentation, particularly maps delineating the protected area and buffer zones. She questioned whether international assistance should be refused for this reason.

The Secretariat and ICOMOS confirmed that Zeyrek is located within the core zone, while Fener and Balat are located within the buffer zone of this World Heritage site, all three being in the Fatih District, as stated in the Working Documents WHC-98/CONF.201/3B (on state of conservation) and WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev (on international assistance). ICOMOS and ICCROM reiterated their strong and full support for this request, underlining the crucial need to protect the urban historic fabric and buffer zones composing the essential setting of World Heritage monuments and buildings. Both advisory bodies stressed the need to promote the active participation of the local inhabitants in maintaining the integrity of urban conservation areas, which require not only the preservation of historic monuments but also of vernacular buildings of architectural value. ICCROM emphasized the importance of this project to strengthen the local management capacity. The Delegate of Japan supported this view, stating the need for the inhabitants’ involvement to preserve the historic urban fabric.

The Delegate of Lebanon suggested that this request be approved on the condition that the Chairperson be authorized to clear the questions raised by the Bureau concerning the location

of the districts of Zeyrek, Fener and Balat. The Chairperson stated that he did not feel competent to study cadastral maps.

The Delegate of Lebanon, furthermore, requested clarification between this activity and the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign of the Historic Centre of Istanbul. The Director of the Division of Cultural Heritage, being responsible for the implementation of this Campaign, informed the Bureau that the Division had so far mobilized funds for the conservation of historic monuments and buildings within this site, such as Hagia Sophia and its mosaics.

The Delegate of Italy stated that she wished to view further detailed information of the project budget breakdown and that the Bureau should not consider this request until such information was provided. The Observer of France confirmed the financial contribution by the Government of France for this project, as indicated in the Document WHC-98/CONF.201/6Rev., specifying that the Ministry of Equipment had made this commitment. The Secretariat noted that the detailed breakdown of the total budget of US\$ 170,920 was indicated in the aforementioned Document, including the details of the US\$ 30,000 requested from the World Heritage Fund.

The Chairperson stated that he did not wish to have an international assistance request approved by the Bureau during his Chairmanship without thorough examination of all necessary details. Furthermore, he underlined the need to be careful in providing international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for the preservation of World Heritage sites within the context of social development projects. The Observer of Finland expressed his agreement with the Chairperson, supporting the view that new usage of the World Heritage Fund should not be created. The Director of the World Heritage Centre stated that there was ample cartographic and socio-economic information on the site in the study undertaken in the European Commission/ UNESCO/Fatih project, and that protection of the architectural fabric of historic urban centres could not be separated from the social development of the inhabitants.

Finally, the Bureau postponed the approval of this request for **US\$ 30,000** to its twenty-second extraordinary session. The Bureau requested that maps clearly indicating the core and buffer zone of the Historic Centre of Istanbul as well as further detailed budget breakdown information be submitted to the Bureau for its examination.

**Distribution limited**

**WHC-98/CONF.203/17  
Kyoto, 4 December 1998  
Original : English/French**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL  
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE  
WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-second session  
Kyoto, Japan**

**30 November – 5 December 1998**

**Item 15: Date, Place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the  
Bureau of the World Heritage Committee**

1. Opening of the session by the Director-General of UNESCO or his representative
2. Adoption of the agenda and the timetable
3. Report of the Secretariat on the Activities undertaken since the twenty-second session of the Committee
4. State of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and on the World Heritage List
5. Information on tentative lists and examination of nominations of cultural and natural properties to the List of World Heritage in Danger and the World Heritage List
6. Follow-up to the work of the Consultative Body of the World Heritage Committee
7. Requests for international assistance
8. Revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
9. Approval of the Committee's report on its activities for 1998-99 to be submitted to the 30<sup>th</sup> session of the General Conference of UNESCO

10. Preparation of the twelfth General Assembly of States Parties
11. Date, place and Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third extraordinary session of the Bureau
12. Provisional Agenda of the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee
13. Other business
14. Adoption of the report of the session
15. Closure of the session



**STATEMENT BY HUNGARY**

The Hungarian Delegation based on its Government's instruction wishes to invite the World Heritage Committee to held one of its regular sessions in Budapest at an appropriate time within the time spar available for Hungary to do so as a Member of the Committee.

In this regard, we wish to inform the Committee that the year 2000 is of special importance for Hungary since it concurs with the celebration of the Millennium of the Hungarian Statehood.

We do recognize the friendly competition of Member States to invite this prestigious international body. Nevertheless we feel that several even procedural solutions may be found in case of the World Heritage Committee wishes to do so.

Under any condition the Hungarian Delegation is of the firm conviction that such an honour would also be a great source of inspiration for the whole region of Central and Eastern Europe that is emerging after a particularly difficult period of transformation. A region that is, as all the other parts of the world, not only very proud of its cultural identity and heritage but constantly referring back and relying having on it as a constant source of inspiration and inexhaustible source for its future as part of its own region of Europe and part of the world as a whole.

**REMARKS ON DOCUMENT  
WHC-98/CONF.203/15****Networking**

1. It is advised to develop a simple (without any additional budgetary consequences at this point) pilot system of Internet-based communication for and among representatives of the different official World Heritage bodies, i.e. members of the (i) World Heritage Committee; (ii) Bureau of the World Heritage Committee; (iii) Consultative Body, etc. As a first step one representative would be identified as a focal point for a particular Member State who would have appropriate clearance for accessing formal and informal documentation of the particular body he or she is a member.

**Geographical Information**

2. It is requested to coordinate activities related to the production of digitized geographical information related to nominations and periodical report documentation. In this regard, a special attention should be paid to produce a geo-referenced, rather than scanned in as a non-raster ("bit map" type) data.

It is considered that a proper professional assessment of all available and potentially accessible geographical information in a proper format is ought to be made one of the basic reference tools for the future Integrated Information Management System.

It is also requested that such an expert assessment should produce a dynamic and flexible standard format for any future geographical data requested from the Member States during nomination and periodic reporting. The same should also apply to the documentation part forward by the Advisory Bodies for consideration by Member States.

Hungarian Delegation  
December 4, 1998

## **Proposal for establishing a World Heritage Fellowship Program (WHIP)**

It is proposed for the Committee to request the World Heritage Centre to prepare a formal report for the 23<sup>rd</sup> regular session of the Bureau about the proposal outlined below with appropriate assessment of the potential financial, organizational and, in particular, substantial consequences regarding training, education and adjustment of the existing imbalances of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the implementation of the Global Strategy for a representative and credible World Heritage List.

### Objective

The main objective of creating a World Heritage Program is to establish a structured, transparent and dynamic framework for addressing the growing challenges concerning constant lack of trained and educated international, national and, last but not least, site managers in States Parties who are most need them. By providing a substantive educational and training tool, in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a new generation of site managers, educators and scientists could be created on a continuous basis establishing a particularly rich tool of World Heritage Alumni, a new network of directly or indirectly interested and involved experts.

Direct cooperation among the new World Heritage Alumni, as well the activities of the participants of the World Heritage Fellowship Program should directly related to the most urgent needs and challenges as it was identified and as it may be adjusted during the development of the program and the related curriculum of the World Heritage Fellowship Program.

### Implementation framework

Duration of the World Heritage Fellowship Program could be around 4-6 months depending of the available funds. Number of participants should remain below 50 persons every given year. Age of the participants, with the exception of the teachers, graduate and post-graduate professors is ought to be limited between 25-40 years to assure a maximum length of time they could serve their respective employers.

The Program's timeframe would be divided into three separate and distinct parts: (i) formal training and classroom teaching at the World Heritage Centre; (ii) on-site training based on the invitation and approved by the World Heritage Committee in a State Party's World Heritage site; (iii) regional visit of World Heritage sites on the tentative list, but not yet nominated formally and/or those sites that are to be undergoing a periodic reporting exercise in the following years, so as to make possible for the Program Participants to contribute individually or as a group to the preparatory work related to the periodic reporting.

A trial period of 3 years could be envisaged during which the financing of the Program would be coming from international financial institutions and/or interested States Parties. At the end of that period, a formal report of the World Heritage Centre with constitutions and in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies should be prepared and submitted to the World Heritage Committee. In case it is approved, the program formally would be established by the General Conference of the World Heritage Convention's States Parties.

Hungarian Delegation  
December 4, 1998



## **GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM**

**Note: In view of matching the English and French versions of this document, a missing sentence, shown in bold, was added following the chapter heading on the production of plaques in the English version and very minor text changes, also shown in bold, were made to the French version.**

# GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

## PREAMBLE

The World Heritage Emblem (hereafter "Emblem") created by the artist Mr. Olyff under contract with UNESCO, was adopted by the second session of the World Heritage Committee as the official Emblem of the World Heritage Convention, symbolizing the interdependence of cultural and natural properties. Although there is no mention of the Emblem in the Convention, its use has been promoted by the Committee to identify properties protected by the Convention and inscribed on the World Heritage List since its adoption in 1978.

The World Heritage Committee is responsible for determining the use of the World Heritage Emblem and for making policy prescriptions regarding how it may be used.

The Emblem symbolizes the Convention, signifies the adherence of States Parties to the Convention, and serves to identify sites inscribed in the World Heritage List. It is associated with public knowledge about the Convention and is the imprimatur of the Convention's credibility and prestige. Above all, it is a representation of the universal values for which the Convention stands.

The Emblem also has fund-raising potential that can be used to enhance the marketing value of products with which it is associated. A balance is needed between the Emblem's use to further the aims of the Convention and optimize knowledge of the Convention worldwide and the need to prevent its abuse for inaccurate, inappropriate, and unauthorized commercial or other purposes.

The Guidelines and Principles for the Use of the Emblem and modalities for quality control should not become an obstacle to co-operation for promotional activities. Authorities responsible for reviewing and deciding on uses of the Emblem (see below) need parameters on which to base their decisions.

## APPLICABILITY OF THESE GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES

The Guidelines and Principles proposed herein cover all proposed uses of the Emblem by:

- The World Heritage Centre;
- The UNESCO Publishing Office and other UNESCO offices;
- Agencies or National Commissions, responsible for implementing the Convention in each State Party;
- World Heritage sites;
- Other contracting parties, especially those operating for predominantly commercial purposes.

## RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATES PARTIES

States Parties to the Convention should take all possible measures to prevent the use of the Emblem in their respective countries by any group or for any purpose not explicitly recognized by the Committee. States Parties are encouraged to make full use of national legislation including Trade Mark Laws.

## INCREASING PROPER USES OF THE EMBLEM

Properties included in the World Heritage List should be marked with the emblem jointly with the UNESCO logo, which should, however, be placed in such a way that they do not visually impair the property in question.

### Production of plaques to commemorate the inclusion of properties in the World Heritage List

**Once a property is included on the World Heritage List, the State Party should place a plaque, whenever possible, to commemorate this inscription.** These plaques are designed to inform the public of the country concerned and foreign visitors that the site visited has a particular value which has been recognized by the international community. In other words, the site is exceptional, of interest not only to one nation, but also to the whole world. However, these plaques have an additional function which is to inform the general public about the World Heritage Convention or at least about the World Heritage concept and the World Heritage List.

The Committee has adopted the following Guidelines for the production of these plaques:

- the plaque should be so placed that it can easily be seen by visitors, without disfiguring the site;
- the World Heritage **Emblem** should appear on the plaque;
- the text should mention the site's exceptional universal value; in this regard it might be useful to give a short description of the site's outstanding characteristics. States Parties may, if they wish, use the descriptions appearing in the various World Heritage publications or in the World Heritage exhibit, and which may be obtained from the Secretariat;
- the text should make reference to the World Heritage Convention and particularly to the World Heritage List and to the international recognition conferred by inscription on this List (however, it is not necessary to mention at which session of the Committee the site was inscribed); it may be appropriate to produce the text in several languages for sites which receive many foreign visitors.

The Committee proposes the following text as an example:

"(Name of site) has been inscribed upon the World Heritage List of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Inscription on this List confirms the exceptional universal value of a cultural or natural site which deserves protection for the benefit of all humanity."  
This text could be then followed by a brief description of the site concerned.

Furthermore, the national authorities should encourage World Heritage Sites to make a broad use of the Emblem such as on their letterheads, brochures and staff uniforms.

Third parties which have received the right to produce communication products related to the World Heritage Convention and Sites must give the Emblem proper visibility. They should avoid creating a different Emblem or logo for that particular product.

## PRINCIPLES

The responsible authorities are henceforth requested to use the following principles in making decisions on the use of the Emblem:

(1) The Emblem should be utilized for all projects substantially associated with the work of the Convention, including, to the maximum extent technically and legally possible, those already approved and adopted, in order to promote the Convention.

(2) A decision to approve use of the Emblem should be linked strongly to the quality and content of the product with which it is to be associated, not on the volume of products to be marketed or the financial return expected. The main criterion for approval should be the educational, scientific, cultural, or artistic value of the proposed product related to World Heritage principles and values. Approval should not routinely be granted to place the Emblem on products that have no, or extremely little, educational value, such as cups, T-shirts, pins, and other tourist souvenirs. Exceptions to this policy will be considered for special events, such as meetings of the Committee and ceremonies at which plaques are unveiled.

(3) Any decision with respect to authorizing the use of the Emblem must be completely unambiguous and in keeping with the explicit and implicit goals and values of the World Heritage Convention.

(4) Except when authorized in accordance with these principles it is not legitimate for commercial entities to use the Emblem directly on their own material to show their support for World Heritage. The Committee recognizes, however, that any individual, organization, or company is free to publish or produce whatever they consider to be appropriate regarding World Heritage sites, but official authorization to do so under the World Heritage Emblem remains the exclusive prerogative of the Committee, to be exercised as prescribed in these Guidelines and Principles.

(5) Use of the Emblem by other contracting parties should normally only be authorized when the proposed use deals directly with World Heritage sites. Such uses may be granted after approval by the national authorities of the countries concerned.

(6) In cases where no specific World Heritage sites are involved or are not the principal focus of the proposed use, such as general seminars and/or workshops on scientific issues or conservation techniques, use may be granted only upon express approval in accordance with these Guidelines and Principles. Requests for such uses should specifically document the manner in which the proposed use is expected to enhance the work of the Convention.

(7) Permission to use the Emblem should not be granted to travel agencies, airlines, or to any other type of business operating for predominantly commercial purposes, except under exceptional circumstances and when manifest benefit to the World Heritage generally or particular World Heritage Sites can be demonstrated. Requests for such use shall require approval in accordance with these Guidelines and Principles and the concurrence of the national authorities of countries specifically concerned.

The Centre is not to accept any advertising, travel, or other promotional considerations from travel agencies or other, similar companies in exchange or in lieu of financial remuneration for use of the Emblem.

(8) When commercial benefits are anticipated, the Centre should ensure that the World Heritage Fund receives a fair share of the revenues and conclude a contract or other agreement that documents the nature of the understandings that govern the project and the arrangements for provision of income to the Fund. In all cases of commercial use, any staff time and related costs for personnel assigned by the Centre or other reviewers, as appropriate, to any initiative, beyond the nominal, must be fully covered by the party requesting authorization to use the Emblem.

National authorities are also called upon to ensure that their sites or the World Heritage Fund receive a fair share of the revenues and to document the nature of the understandings that govern the project and the distribution of any proceeds.

(9) If sponsors are sought for manufacturing products whose distribution the Centre considers necessary, the choice of partner or partners should be consistent, at a minimum, with the criteria set forth in Annex V of the "Internal Guidelines for Private Sector Fund-Raising in Favour of UNESCO," and with such further fund-raising guidance as the Committee may prescribe. The necessity for such products should be clarified and justified in written presentations that will require approval in such manner as the Committee may prescribe.

## AUTHORIZATION PROCEDURE FOR THE USE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM

### A. SIMPLE AGREEMENT OF THE NATIONAL AUTHORITIES

National authorities may grant the use of the Emblem to a national entity, provided that the project, whether national or international, involves only World Heritage sites located on the same national territory. National authorities decision should be guided by the Guidelines and Principles.

### B. AGREEMENT REQUIRING QUALITY CONTROL OF CONTENT

Any other request for authorization to use the Emblem should adopt the following procedure:

- (a) A request indicating the objective of the use of the Emblem, its duration and territorial validity, should be addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.
- (b) The Director of the World Heritage Centre has the authority to grant the use of the Emblem in accordance with the Guidelines and Principles. For cases not covered, or not sufficiently covered, by the Guidelines and Principles, the Director refers the matter to the Chairperson who, in the most difficult cases, might wish to refer the matter to the Bureau for final decision. A yearly report on the authorized uses of the Emblem will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee.
- (c) Authorization to use the Emblem in major products to be widely distributed over an undetermined period of time is conditional upon obtaining the manufacturer's commitment to consult with countries concerned and secure their endorsement of texts and images illustrating sites situated in their territory, at no cost to the Centre, together with the proof that this has been done. The text to be approved should be provided in either one of the official languages of the Committee or in the language of the country concerned. A draft model form to be used by third parties to obtain States Parties' authorization for the use of the Emblem appears as an appendix to this document.

- (d) After having examined the request and considered it as acceptable, the Centre may establish an agreement with the partner.
- (e) If the Director judges that a proposed use of the Emblem is not acceptable, the Centre informs the requesting party of the decision in writing.

#### **RIGHT OF STATES PARTIES TO EXERT QUALITY CONTROL**

Authorization to use the Emblem is inextricably linked to the requirement that the national authorities may exert quality control over the products with which it is associated.

- (1) The States Parties to the Convention are the only parties authorized to approve the content (images and text) of any distributed product appearing under the World Heritage Emblem with regard to the sites located in their territories.
- (2) States Parties that protect the Emblem legally must review these uses.
- (3) Other States Parties may elect to review proposed uses or refer such proposals to the World Heritage Centre. States Parties are responsible for identifying an appropriate national authority and for informing the Centre whether they wish to review proposed uses or to identify uses that are inappropriate. The Centre will maintain a list of responsible national authorities.

## **Appendix**

### Content Approval Form

**[Name of responsible national body]**, officially identified as the body responsible for approving the content of the texts and photos relating to the World Heritage sites located in the territory of **[name of country]**, hereby confirms to **[name of producer]** that the text and the images that it has submitted for the **[name of sites]** World Heritage site(s) are **[approved]** **[approved subject to the following changes requested]** **[are not approved]**

(delete whatever entry does not apply, and provide, as needed, a corrected copy of the text or a signed list of corrections).

#### Notes:

It is recommended that the initials of the responsible national official be affixed to each page of text.

The National Authorities are given one month from their acknowledged receipt in which to authorize the content, following which the producers may consider that the content has been tacitly approved, unless the responsible National Authorities request in writing a longer period.

Texts should be supplied to the National Authorities in one of the two official languages of the Committee, or in the official language (or in one of the official languages) of the country in which the sites are located, at the convenience of both parties.